

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY AND OCTOBER, 1920.

THE MSS. OF CALLIMACHVS' HYMNS.

(Continued.)

III. II, D, AND POLITIAN'S AND LASCARIS' EDITIONS.

Π¹ is Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, *grec suppl.* 1095;² foll. 280 (paper), cmm. 33, 5 × 22, 8,³ with forty lines to the page; cent. late XV. Contents: f. 1^r, Life of Homer ("Ὅμηρος ὁ ποιητὴς τίνων μὲν κτλ.). 1^v-24^v, Plutarch's dissertation on Homer (Περὶ σσὸν μὲν ἴσως κτλ.). 25-222^r, *Iliad*, with scholia. 223-4, blank. 225^r-245^r, *Homeric Hymns* III.-XXXIII. (but IV. 494-580, V. 1-152, and XXIV.-XXVIII. or XXV.-XXIX., are missing); then the epigram εἰς ξένους (*Epigr.* I. Baum.).⁴ 245^r, an epigram on Callimachus' works,⁵ which runs thus in this manuscript:

Ἵμνῶ τὸν ὑψίζυγον ἐν πρώτοις δία
φοῖβον δ' ἔπειτα καὶ τρίτην τὴν ἄρτεμιν
δῆλον τετάρτην εἶτα λουτρά παλάδος.
ἔκτην δὲ τὴν δῆμητραν τὴν παλαιτέραν.
μέλπω δὲ γραὸς τῆς φιλοξένου τρόπη.
καὶ τὴν τελευτέαν τὴν ἄγραν.
καὶ τῶν μεγίστων αἰτίων τὴν τετράδα.
σκώπτω δ' ἐπ' ἀραῖς ἴβον ἀπολλώνιον
καὶ τὴν ἀθηνᾶν ὕστατον μέλπω πάλιν
γρίφῳ βαθίστῳ καὶ δυσσευρήτοις λόγοις.

¹ See L. Delisle, *Bibl. Nationale, Catalogue des Manuscrits des Fonds Libri et Barrois* (1888), p. 125; Omont, *Inventaire Sommaire*; Nigra, *ib. cit.*, XX. (1892), pp. 209-212; A. Ludwig, *op. cit.*, p. 124; T. W. Allen, Vol. V. of *Homeri Opera* (Oxford Text), p. 190.

² Formerly Ashburnham 1198, Libri 8070. For the *Homeric Hymns* it is II; for Proclus, P.

³ So Delisle, *l.c.*; Nigra, *l.c.*, p. 209, says cmm. 33, 7 × 23.

⁴ Cf. *Q, F, At*.

⁵ I cite it from Nigra, *l.c.* For an emended text, see Wilamowitz, p. 4. The poem recurs in a printed copy from Berne (see *Hermes*. XXVI., p. 308); and ll. 1-4 in *F, At, T*, and (by addition) *I*. Politian (*Misc.* XXIV.) cites l. 5. Nigra discusses the items named (*l.c.*, pp. 210-211).

245^v-258^r, Callimachus' *Hymns*, with marginal and interlinear scholia. 258^v-274^r, Orpheus, *Hymns*. 274^r-276^v, Proclus, *Hymns*. 276^v, *Batrachomyomachia*. The manuscript once belonged to the Abbey of St. Peter at Perugia, as we learn from two notes at the beginning and the end of the volume. Of the gatherings Nigra (*l.c.*) says '*Nel margine esterno inferiore vi è traccia dell' antica numerazione di registro, tagliata dal legatore. Da questa ultima numerazione appare che il codice era composto di 3 quaderni (a b c) e di 26 quinterni (d-y e A-G). Ma mancano 3 interi fogli nel quinterno C e uno nel quinterno D.*' This last came between ff. 248^v and 249^r, and contained Call. III. 66-145. Ludwig (*l.c.*) says, presumably only of the part containing Proclus, '*codex . . . quem duo eiusdem temporis (saec. XV.) librarii alternis exarauerunt, deinde recentiores correxerunt.*' In the Callimachean portion one hand alone appears, alike in text and scholia. Abbreviations are more frequent in the latter, but are not uncommon in the former also, where they include the symbols for -av, -ais, -as, -eiv, -eis, -ev, -ην, -ης, -is, -ov, -os, -ous, -ται, -ων, with οί, καί (in two forms), φασί, and ἄνθρωπος, οὐρανός, πατήρ, and μήτηρ. Uncontracted suprascript letters, none of them much used thus, are -a, -ai, -ais, -ε, ευσ, -η, -νη, -ς, -σσι, -τα, -το, -ω. Ligatures abound, especially those with υ as the first element. Both ρ and γ are used, and final -σ almost completely ousts -ς. *Iota subscr.* is never used. A large initial letter, projecting into the margin, is found, introducing a speech, at IV. 266, VI. 46; resuming after a speech, at III. 26, IV. 99, 121, 153, 228, 249, 274, VI. 50; and, without either of these reasons, at IV. 141, 147, VI. 59, 91, and in the odd lines of *Hymn V.* στίχοι are given for all six *Hymns*.

Of the quality of this manuscript Wilamowitz¹ sagaciously remarks: '*scriba, quem Graecum non fuisse Τρῳεζήνος ostendit, quod in scholio 4, 41 semel ei excidit, laudem elegantiae et probitatis unam quaesivit. doctus nec erat nec uideri uolebat; itaque ab emendando se continuit, glossas paruas una cum textu descripsit, longiora scholia pleraque omisit, calami errores perraro correxit.*' Thus the scribe gives ὄω for εἶσω (IV. 59), ἐκ for οὐκ (IV. 215), φαίη for λαίφη (IV. 319), πόδα τέρεν for πόδες φέρεν (VI. 10); from III. 8 he omits ἔα, without leaving a space; and he omits letters or syllables in no less than fourteen places, sometimes most flagrantly. Permutations of letters number forty-four; insertions of letters or syllables, four; mis-division of words occurs five times, non-division seven times; and mistakes of accent and breathing are not infrequent.

D² is Florence, Laurentian, XXXII. 45; foll. 181 (parchment), cmm. 26, 7×17, 8; cent. XV. Contents: f. 1, Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica*, lacking the title. 106^v, Orpheus, *Argonautica*, without title. 131, Orpheus, *Hymns*. 152^r-155^v, Proclus, *Hymns* I.-VII. 155^v(?)-181, *Homeric Hymns* III.-VII. 33. The manuscript, as it stands now, is mutilated, ending

¹ *Praef.*, p. 11.

² See A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum MSS. bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentianae* (Florence, 1763-70), II., pp. 204-5; A. Ludwig, *op. cit.*, p. 123;

Allen-Sikes, *Homeric Hymns*, p. X. For Proclus it is E; for *Homeric Hymns*, L¹. Mr. Allen says it has ff. 170, and assigns ff. 144-170 to *Homeric Hymns*.

abruptly
the Med
'Homer.
euulsum
Sauonaro
editio pri
grounds,
publicati
Lascaris
accept W
catalogue
Villari's
'Savonar
great was
Medici lib
of the con

Politi
Hymn V.
century, in
(i.) In
mini, 1489
Politiani r
praestare c
Pallade: q
Greek text
ings, accen
owing to 'a
shown in th
iota of full
printed co
III αλλουκ
from their
XXIV. Poli
and Hymn
In Chap. L
and iota sub
(ii.) In
Domizio Ca

¹ See E. Pic
alle vicende della
Storico Italiano,
100-129, 254-28
XXI. (1875), pp
² *Praef.*, p. 1

abruptly with the conclusion of a quinion; but a list of books in the library of the Medici family, compiled in 1495, adds Callimachus' *Hymns* to those of 'Homer.'¹ Wilamowitz thinks that '*probabile est eo ipso tempore [1495] iam euulsum fuisse Callimachum (direpta scilicet per turbas et seditionem populi a fratre Sauonarola excitati Mediceorum bibliotheca) et prelis traditum, ut describeretur editio princeps a Iano Lascari, ut ferunt, anno 1494 parata.*'² But there are grounds, as we shall see, for regarding 1496 (or later), not 1494, as the year of publication of Lascaris' edition; and in view of these, and of the fact that Lascaris had the publishing of other Greek works on hand in 1494, I cannot accept Wilamowitz' assumption as against the explicit statement of the 1495 catalogue. And against his '*direpta . . . bibliotheca*' may be set Miss L. M. Villari's remarks,³ in writing of the burning of the 'vanities' in 1497: 'Savonarola was neither a foe to art nor to learning. On the contrary, so great was his respect for both that, when there was a question of selling the Medici library to pay that family's debts, he saved the collection at the expense of the convent purse.'

*Politian.*⁴—Politian's was the first printed edition; but it contained only *Hymn* V. and a few other lines. It was published thrice in the fifteenth century, in Chapter LXXX. of his *Miscellanea*:

(i.) In a separate edition of the *Miscellanea*⁵ (Florence, Antonio Miskomini, 1489). At the end of the *Praefatio* we are told that '*Familiares quidam Politiani recognovere. Politianus ipse nec hortographian se ait, nec omnino alienam praestare culpam.*' Chapter LXXX. is entitled '*Fabula ignotior de Tiresia et Pallade: qua sensus aperitur Propertianus*'; and he gives there, following the Greek text, a translation in Latin elegiac couplets. From the Greek, breathings, accents, apostrophes, and interrogation marks are omitted, probably owing to 'a deliberate decision in favour of greater simplicity' than had been shown in the Parma fount of type.⁶ For *iota subscr.* is substituted an adscript *iota* of full text-size; and not only enclitics but also some other words are printed continuously with preceding or following words (e.g. 7 οὐδοκαδη, IIII αλλουκαντον). Printer's errors include the omission of ll. 61-2—probably from their likeness to 63-4, for they appear in the Latin version. In Chap. XXIV. Politian quotes μέλω δὲ γράδς τῆς φιλοξένου τρόπους (see above, p. 105) and *Hymn* II. 105-6, with the scholium thereon; in Chap. XXXV., *Hymn* I. 8-9. In Chap. LII. he cites *Hymn* II. 58-63, with accents and breathings affixed and *iota subscr.* in use; his ἐνδοθι (for ἐγγύθι, 59) is found in no manuscript.

(ii.) In a composite volume, together with works by Filippo Beroaldo, Domizio Calderini, and Giambattista Pio (Brescia, 1496).

¹ See E. Piccolomini, *Intorno alle condizioni ed alle vicende della libreria Medicea privata*, in *Archivio Storico Italiano*, Third Series, XIX. (1874), pp. 100-129, 254-281; XX. (1874), pp. 51 sqq.; XXI. (1875), pp. 102 sqq., 282 sqq.; 538 sq.

² *Praef.*, p. 11.

³ In *Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'Savonarola.'

⁴ See Nigra, *lib. cit.*, XX. (1892), pp. 414 sqq.

⁵ *Angeli Politiani Miscellaneorum Centuriae Primae ad Laurentium Medicem.*

⁶ See R. Proctor, *The Printing of Greek in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1910), p. 133.

(iii.) In the Aldine edition of Politian's works (Venice, 1498),¹ with the Greek text of V. 61-2 inserted.

All three editions alike are without scholia.

*Janus Lascaris.*²—The *editio princeps* of all six *Hymns* of Callimachus, in small quarto, with twenty-four lines of text to the full page, lacks all indications of the date and place of publication, and of the printer's name. Contents: ff. 1-24^r, *Hymns* I.-VI., headed Καλλιμάχου Κυρηναίου ὕμνοι. | Εἰς Δία, and followed by Τέλος τῶν εὕρισκομένων Καλλιμάχου ὕμνων. 24^v, a Greek poem,³ headed Εἰς Καλλιμάχον and with the subscription Δασκάρως. The gatherings of the text are in quaternions; and at the foot of the obverse page of each folio is printed the letter of its quaternion (A, B, or Γ), followed by a Roman numeral (I., II., III., or IIII.). Some copies add (ff. 25^r-34^r) scholia, headed Σχόλια παλαιὰ τῶν Καλλιμάχου ὕμνων. | Εἰς τὸν διός, and followed by Τέλος τῶν σχολίων. f. 34^v is blank. These scholia are gathered in a ternion followed by a binion, with a separate numeration (Ai, Aii, Aiii, Bi, Bii) from the text. The letters of the text are Roman capitals,⁴ with the rough and the smooth breathings represented respectively by the first and the second half of π (⊥ and ⊥).⁵ Larger capitals, lacking accents and breathings, mark proper names, the beginnings of paragraphs, and the hexameter lines of *Hymn* V. As in Politian's first edition, *iota adscriptum* replaces *iota subscriptum*, but here it is only half the size of the adjacent letter. In contrast with Politian's text, accents are marked, the circumflex being a blend (ς) of acute and grave;⁶ and punctuation is supplied by the use of the *punctum* (in its three kinds) and the *uirgula*. The initial letters of all the *Hymns* (except I.), and of the first scholium on each *Hymn*, are lacking. In the scholia both rubrics and annotations are in lower-case (minuscule) type.

The date of this book is uncertain. It has been variously assigned to 1494, 1495, 1496, and 'about' 1497-8. It appears that we must reckon with two editions; for some copies have the scholia, while others lack them, and we have seen that in the former the gatherings of the scholia differ in number of folios from those of the text and have a separate numeration. The capital type used for the text is found also in a series of works published at Florence, under the direction of Janus Lascaris and with Lorenzo di Alopa as the printer; and the lower-case type of the scholia is represented in some books of this same series. On these facts, and the presence of Lascaris' epigram on

¹ *Opera Omnia Angeli Politiani, et alia quaedam lectu digna, quorum nomina ex sequenti indice videre licet.*

² See M. Maittaire, *Annales Typographici* (Amsterdam, 1733), I. 101-7, 759; J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (fourth edition, Hamburg), p. 825; L. Hain, *Repertorium Bibliographicum* (Stuttgart, 1827), I., Part 2, No. 4266; Nigra, *ib. cit.*, XX. (1892), pp. 418 sqq. Four copies of *ed. pr.* are in the British Museum; one each

in the Bodleian, in Rylands Library, Manchester, and in the Earl of Crawford's Library at Haigh Hall, Wigan. Blomfield cites it as *L* in his edition of the *Hymns* (1815) for nearly 300 readings, misquoting it in about 30.

³ Ἰχθὺς μαρτυρῶν κτλ.

⁴ On the significance of this innovation see Proctor, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

⁵ Maittaire, *op. cit.*, I., p. 103.

⁶ Maittaire, *l.c.*

f. 24^v, the and edit was pub machus; its lost p text and have bee as we ha Further, belong to placed r till the e issuing o

Wh is uncert published *Hymn* is announce editions of a scho has τρώγ in rubric in text Frobenia is difficu acquired period of to have e the Frob and rubr himself Alopa, w mera conti

Polit the Hom

¹ *Op. cit.* machus in points out the first of this fatory letter of his new t
² See bel
³ See bel
⁴ So Pro
of I, Lascaris in 1495, as Lascaris, Joh

f. 24^v, the *ed. pr.* of the *Hymns* may reasonably be assigned to the same press and editor. Mr. Proctor's *criteria*¹ give us 1494, when the *Alopa Anthology* was published, as the earlier limit for dating the unannotated text of Callimachus; but if April 29, 1496, be the true date of *I*,² and if *I* itself (and not its lost parent or some lost brother) be one source of *ed. pr.*,³ obviously both text and scholia of Lascaris' *Hymns* come later than *I*. Again, *D* seems to have been the source of much of Lascaris' text;⁴ and the 1495 catalogue, as we have noticed, shows that in that year *D* still contained the *Hymns*. Further, 1496 is the date of the *Alopa* Apollonius Rhodius, whose scholia belong to the same subdivision of the lower-case type as Callimachus', but are placed round the text. If Lascaris did not follow Charles VIII. to France till the end of 1496,⁵ he and *Alopa* may have had time from May to add to the issuing of *Lucian*⁶ the preparation and publication of the *Hymns*.

Whether the Callimachean scholia belong to the same year, or fall later, is uncertain, especially in view of the problem of their relationship to those published by Gelenius in the Frobenian edition (Basle, 1532), where each *Hymn* is followed immediately by its own scholia. For (1) Froben's title-page announces the *Hymns* 'cum scholiis nunc primum aeditis'; and (2) while these editions have in common a handful of other discrepancies between the rubric of a scholium and the text of the *Hymn* to which it refers, at III. 133 Froben has *πρώγει* in both text and rubric, *Alopa* *πρώει* (of all *codd.*) in text but *πρώγει* in rubric, and at III. 109 *Alopa* shows a wider divergence than Froben (both in text *κεραύνιος*: in rubric Froben *κεραυννίος*, *Alopa* *κεραύνειος*). The Frobenian claim to priority is certainly explicit; but, if we admit it as true, it is difficult to find a date after 1532 for the *Alopa* lower-case type. Callierges acquired it, with the large and small capitals, in 1517 or earlier; but his period of activity as a printer at Rome, under the protection of Leo X., seems to have ended with the publication of a *Lexicon* in May, 1523.⁷ If we reject the Frobenian statement as false, and ascribe *ed. pr.*'s divergences between text and rubric to carelessness, we may hold it probable that Lascaris did not himself edit these scholia,⁸ and attribute their publication to Florence and *Alopa*, with a date not long after Lascaris' retirement to Paris.⁹ But this is *mera coniectura*.

Politian's Source.—The near relationship of *D* to *II* has been proved for the *Homeric Hymns* by Mr. Allen.¹⁰ Consequently, while the belief that

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 79-80. He places the Callimachus in 1495. Maittaire (*op. cit.*, p. 105) points out that the *Anthology* must have been the first of this *Alopa* series, in view of its prefatory letter in which Lascaris explains the basis of his new type.

² See below.

³ See below, p. 110.

⁴ See below, p. 110.

⁵ So Proctor, p. 79. If 1496 be the true date of *I*, Lascaris can hardly have removed to Paris in 1495, as *Encyclopædia Britannica* states (art. *Lascaris, Johannes*).

⁶ See Proctor, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ So Nigra, *lib. cit.*, XX. (1892), p. 419.

⁹ Like Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* and Cebes' *Πινναξ*, of which Proctor (p. 79) says that 'these small books may well have been set up after his departure, and in either case would not have taken long to print. They agree in every respect with the *Lucian*.'

¹⁰ In *J.H.S.* XV. (1895), p. 164. He regards it as possible that they are not direct copies of the same manuscript.

Politian's edition may have been, and that Lascaris' was, based on *D* is obviously incapable of direct proof, a strong presumption in its favour is established by a review of the readings which *D*'s kinsman *Π*, alone among the extant manuscripts, shares with Politian's or Lascaris' text, or with both.¹ Such readings are very few.

Π and Politian share the following readings, against *cett.* and *ed. pr.*: V. 47 ὦ δῶλαι *Π*, ὠδῶλαι *Pol.* (against αἱ δῶλαι, αἱ δῶλαι, αἱ δοῦλαι, αἱ δοῦναι, οἱ δοῦναι); 77 εἴλυθε (against ἤλυθε); 107 ὄσσα (against πάσσα, πᾶσσα, πᾶσα, πόσσα, or lacuna). At 132 they share μόνα (μόναι *Pol.*) only with *z*² (against μῶνα, μῶνα, μούνα); at 25 they alone² have λαβοῖσα, to which *Π*'s margin adds γρ'βαλοῖσα (against λαβούσα, λαβῶσα, λαβῶσα, βαλοῖσα). They share with *ed. pr.* 78 θέμιδες (against θεμιτὰ, θεμιτ, or lacuna).

Sources of the Editio Princeps.—(i.) *D*. The readings monopolized by *Π* and *ed. pr.* occur in some of the lacunose passages whose consideration is postponed for other purposes, consisting of IV. 255, VI. 13, 22, 23 (cf. V. 78, 136). In some other readings *Π* and *ed. pr.* agree in company with a few other manuscripts, viz.:

- IV. 52 ἀντιμοιβὸν *Π ed. pr. x*: ἀντημοικὸν *Ee*, ἀντημοιβὸν *cett.*
 127 ἐξερύσει *Π ed. pr. EeF*: ἐξερύξει *x*, ἐξερύσσει *S*, ἐξερύσει *με z*².
 130 διψαλέην *Π ed. pr. EeF*: διψαλέον *xS*, δαψιλέων *G*, δαψιλέην *HI*.
 132 εἰλήθειαν *Π ed. pr. x*: εἰλείθυιαν *z*², εἰλήθυιαν *E*, εἰλήθυιαν *cett.*
 150 εἰσόκέ (οἱ) *Π* (in marg.) *ed. pr. x*: εἰσόκέν *Ee*, εἰσόκεν *ΠG*, εἰσόκε *cett.*
 209 ἀπὸ *Π ed. pr. z*: ἀπο (sic) *cett.*
 307 ἱρὸν *Π ed. pr. EeI*: ἱερὸν *cett.*
 VI. 15 *Π ed. pr.* with *x* have only τρίς δ' ἐπὶ καλλι: *cett.* all give more, except *S*, which has only τρίς δ' ἐπὶ.
 At VI. 37 (ἦ *ed. pr.*, εἰσ *Π*, ἦν *cett.*) Lascaris perhaps found ἦς in *D*.

(ii.) *I* is an aid frequently used by Lascaris. The evidence under this head will be found when we consider successively the distinctive readings of *z*, *z*², and *I*, where *I* append 'Lascaris' or 'Lasc.' to those in which his edition shares.

(iii.) *Politian*.—His first edition of *Hymn V.* was consulted by Lascaris, as is shown by the following agreements against the manuscripts:

¹ *Π*'s history before it came to Perugia is unknown, whereas we do know *D* to have been a Medicean MS. Hence the latter seems a more likely source than the former for Politian's and Lascaris' readings.

² I assume the change from βαλοῖσα (so *Q*) to λαβοῖσα in *S* to be subsequent to Politian's publication of his text; we have seen that C. Lascaris used the latter elsewhere (pp. 66-7 above).

V. 16
20
24
49
65
69
87
93
102
130
137

Of t
true read
The
Lascaris'
his own,
ten perm
λητωίδι
VI. 42
non-divis
accent an
z group,
δέποτε, ο
δτ', VI. 9
he somet
sometime
θύης).

Of r
manuscri
94 ἐνεμε
178 ἐπι
154 εἰναλ
βολίαι, 1
44 κατω
after ὁμό
shares w
II. 80 πο
ξατο *G*),
δηλίας (ἀ
ἐπι (*E*),
nearer th

¹ His o
edition) an

	Politian, Lascaris.	MSS.
V. 16 ἀθαναία (<i>H</i> independently)		ἀθηναία
20 ἔβλεψεν (<i>E</i> „)		ἔβλεψαν, ἔκλεψαν
24 οἶα παρ' (<i>E</i> „)		οἶα περ; οἶα περ.
49 ὕδατα		ὑδατι
65 εἰ . . . διφρωι Pol., ἐὼ . . . δίφρωι Lasc.		ἐὼ . . . δίφρω
69 εὔσαν		ἔσσαν, οὔσαν
87 ἀφείλεο		ἀφείλετο
93 λαβοῖσα		λαβοῦσα
102 μισθῶ . . . μεγάλωι (-ωι . . . -ωι Pol.)		μισθῶ . . . μεγάλω
130 φοιτάσει		φοιτάσει
137 ἔρχετ' (ἀθαναία) Pol. : ἔρχε τ' (<i>sic</i>) Lasc.		ἔρχεται

Of these conjectures of Politian, all but those at 65, 69, and 102¹ give the true reading.

The Callimachean portion of *D* being lost, we cannot tell what of Lascaris' graphical errors, not found in *I* nor (for *Hymn* V.) in Politian, are his own, and what he received from *D*. His unshared weaknesses consist of ten permutations of letters, and eight transpositions (II. 110 δοιῆι: III. 45 λητωίδι θυγατέρας: IV. 280 οἴην, 306 ἀσαφλές, 310 μήκυμα: V. 73 λόωντο: VI. 42 νιππῖκη, 104 ἀπηρέικαντι); insertion of letters three, omission four; non-division of words two, mis-division two; and minor defects in regard to accent and breathing. Also, he favours οὐκ ἔτι (with *H*), ἐξ ἔτι (*H*), ἄρ (the *z* group, for ἄρ'), οὐ δέ and μὴ δέ; and even has οὐ ποτε (once οὐπο τ'), οὐ δέποτε, οὐ δέ τι (IV. 289), τοσσόν δε (IV. 270), τοσσάς δε (IV. 253), δ τ' (for δτ', VI. 9), ὡς τ' (for ὡστ', VI. 28), ἔς τ' (VI. 10, 11). His small adscript *iota* he sometimes adds wrongly (τῆνος *passim*: III. 40 ἐπεκρήνηε, 74 δοίηι) and sometimes applies in place of the normal *iota* (nine times; e.g. ὕωνοι, εἰλειθυῆς).

Of readings given by the *editio princeps*, and not found in any extant manuscript, the following are correct: I. 41 νίωνοι, 87 νοήση: II. 2 οἶα, 94 ἐνειμεν: III. 16 ἐνδρομίδας, 17 εὐ κομέοιεν, 29 ὅτε, 70 μορμύσσεται, 170 ἔνι, 178 ἐπι προγένοντο, 184 ἔξοχα, 207 ἔνι, 224 νᾶεν: IV. 10 κύνθιος, 36 ἄφετος, 154 εἰναλίας: V. 7 φέροισα, 20 διαφαινομένην, 105 ἀνίκα, 105 κομίζεν, 112 ἐκαβολίαι, 127 ἀξεῖ: VI. 18 πολίεσσιν, 35 ἀξιναισιν, 41 χωσαμένα, 43 δαμοσίαν, 44 κατωμαδιαν, 111 ἔνι, 122 φέροισα. At VI. 117 Lascaris rightly punctuates after ὁμότοιχος, not (as *codd.*) after ἐμοῖ. The following correct readings he shares with manuscripts which perhaps he did not use: I. 10 παρρασίη (*CES*): II. 80 πολύλλυτε (*B*): IV. 19 ὀπιθεν (*KEe*), 108 ἐφθέγγατο (*SQqEH*: ἐπεφθέγγατο *G*), 246 ἐχαρίσσατο (*H*), 248 ἀνθείλετο (*K*), 264 εἴλεο (*SQqEeF*), 323 ἀ δηλιάς (ἄ δ- *E*): V. 24 εὐρώτα (-α *E*), 47 αἰ δῶλαι (*xq*: αἰ δῶλαι *Ee*): VI. 38 ἐπι (*E*), 54 δαῖτας (*KH*), 61 ἀναγκαία (-αία *E*). In the following cases he gets nearer than the manuscripts to the true reading: IV. 104 λάρισσα, 195 εἰσε-

¹ His other unsuccessful conjectures (first edition) are εἰκασεν (V. 18), δαμων (39), and οσσα (108).

θέλουσαν: V. 27 οἴην: VI. 137 ἄροσε κείνος. Probably right is his ἡ ὄγε (III. 150), while at IV. 205 he substitutes ἄρρητον for ἄρητον (*codd.*, except ἄκρητον *E*, ἄλυτον *z*²), and reads πέρι (*EeF*) at III. 135 and τόσσα δέοι at IV. 246. At III. 155 his τί δέ κεν is accepted by Schneider (τί κεν *codd.*, τί κέ μιν Wilamowitz). At III. 197 he shares ἐσάωσεν with Δ (ἐσάωσαν *cett.*).

Ingenious, but wrong or unnecessary, are I. 84 δλβον: III. 25 κόλπων (cf. I. 15), 179 κερααλκέες, 248 εὐρυθέμεθλον: IV. 36 ἀπέπλεες, 62 ὑποπτεύοντες, 188 ἐσσόμεναι: VI. 118 (in lacuna) εἶπατε, none of which the manuscripts give; also V. 58 τᾶν ἐτερᾶν (with *SQq*). At III. 238 his παρραλήν ἐφέσου seems based on Strabo, XIV. 1 § 20. Clearly wrong are II. 52 ἀγάλακτοι, 53 διες (? *G*), 56 πτολίεσσι: III. 21 ὀξείαισιν (*BCK*), 81 ἡ μοί τι (*BC*), 108 αἰνεσίησιν, 109 κεραύνιος, 125 ἐπιβόσκειται, 147 ἔστηκεν, 172 ἐνι, 198 νύμφαν, 244 τετρήνοντο, 261 πτόλιν: IV. 50 ἀγγαίου, 99 αὖθις, 124 ἐμοῖο (*BCFGH*), 158 ὑφ' ὁμοκλήης (*K*: the Ionic ὁ- with ὑπ' is right), 166 ὕπο, 174 ὀψιγόνου, 257 ἐληθύνης, 266 ὦ μεγάλ' ὦ: V. 10 λυσσαμένα, 27 κοῦραι (*B*): VI. 39 πρᾶτα, 54 θασεῖ, 58 χέρσφ (*e*), 58 ὀλύμπφ, 92 μείζων, 114 τότ' ὁ (*SQeF*), 120 χ' ᾤσαι. 125 ὥς (twice), 128 ἀτελέστας, 134 ἐν τ' ὁμονοία, 136 φέρβε μᾶλα.

IV. *E* AND *e*.

*E*¹ is Paris, Bibl. Nat., *grec* 2763;² foll. 243 (paper); cmm. 22×14, 6, with twenty lines to the page; cent. XV. Contents: f. 2, Orpheus, *Argonautica*. 32, Orpheus, *Hymns*. 58-60^v, Proclus, *Hymns* I.-V. 61^r-88^v, Callimachus, *Hymns*, with marginal and interlinear scholia. 89^r, blank. 91-129, *Homeric Hymns* III.-XXXIII., and epigram *εἰς ξένους* (*Epigr.* I. Baum.). 129^v, Moschus, *Ἔρως δραπετής*. 130^v, Musaeus, *Hero and Leander*. 143, Hesiod, *Works and Days*, with the preface of Proclus Diadochus. 167, Hesiod, *Shield of Heracles*. 179, thirteen lines of *Anth. Plan.*, 92 (= *Anth. Dübner*, XVI. 92).³ 180, Hesiod, *Theogony*. 203, Theocritus, *Idylls*, prefaced by his Life. Gatherings are indicated by catch-words, on the same system as in *Q*; for Callimachus they occur on ff. 70^v and 80^v, thus showing a division into quinions. The hand that wrote the Callimachean portion is not that of Proclus' *Hymns*. It has written alike text, interlinear corrections and glosses, and *marginalia*, and is a small fine script, not very easy to read, in which *a* and *e* are often closely alike. Ligatures abound. Contractions, though frequent in the scholia, are very rare in the text. *Iota subscr.* is used.

*e*⁴ is Milan, *Ambrosianus* 734 (*S* 31 sup.);⁵ foll. V⁶+315 (paper); cmm. 23, 2×16, with eighteen lines to the page; cent. XV. Contents: f. 1^r inscribed

¹ See H. Omont, *Inventaire Sommaire des Manuscrits grecs de la Bibl. Nat.* (Paris, 1886-98); Allen-Sikes, *Homeric Hymns*, p. ix; Schneider, *Praef.* XXXI.; A. Ludwig, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

² Formerly Colbert 4906, Regius 3202. For the *Homeric Hymns* it is *A*; for Proclus, *g*.

³ Also in *H*.

⁴ See E. Martini and D. Bassi, *op. cit.*: Allen-

Sikes, *op. cit.*, p. x; Schneider, *Praef.* XXXII.; Nigra, *lib. cit.*, XX. (1892), p. 203; Ludwig, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

⁵ Wilamowitz does not mention it. Schneider calls it *f*; but as it is closely akin to *E*, not *F*, I have renamed it *e*. For *Homeric Hymns* it is *Q*; for Proclus, *δ*.

⁶ Ff. I. and V. are of parchment.

Liber is amicoru lines); the end LXXVI LXXVI and IV I.-XXX and XX ὁμήρου δραπετήν line τοι with ma Odes, I.- Nemean To Pind there n frag. 1 quinion Ioh. Rh the MS fifteenth Contrac syllable ην, ης, α -σσοι, -α E V. Be elaborat probabl as e, w V.+VI. scripts. Lycoph passive scholia of all t

¹ Cf. *g*.
² This
³ Parisian
Allen-Sik
⁴ It ooc
⁵ W. C
1899, p. 2)
is found i
See o

Liber iste est mej marci antonij de passeris Ianuensis <in margin Patavini> et amicorum, and below J.V.^{Plu.} 2, Orpheus, *Hymns* I. (with introductory lines); II.-XV. 1-11; XVI.; XVII. 1-10; XVIII.-LIX. 1-21; LX.-LXV. (at the end is added the line εἰρήνην ποθέων κουροτρόφον ὀλβιοδῶτιν); LXVI.-LXXVII. (from which latter ψύχῃσι . . . θνητῶν of ll. 4-5 are wanting); LXXVIII.-LXXX. 1-5; LXXXI.-LXXXVII. 35^v, Proclus, *Hymns* I.-V. (III. and IV. are united). 39-89, *Homeric Hymns* (Baumeister's enumeration) I.-XXXIII., with I. and II. united, and lacking V., XVIII. 13-49, XXVI. 14-20, and XXXII. 20 to end; at the end, δευρὶ πέλας λάχε τῶν εὐδαίμονας ∴ ὕμνων ὁμήρου ∴² 39, at top of margin, *Anth. Dübner*, IX. 48.³ 90, Moschus, *Ἔρως δραπέτης*. 91, Musaeus, *Hero and Leander*, ll. 1-245. 98^r, blank but for the line τοιαῦδ' ἐρωμανέεσσιν ἄεθλ' ἀπόκειτ' αἰζηοῖς. 98^v-128^v, Callimachus, *Hymns*, with marginal and interlinear scholia. 129-131, blank. 132, Pindar, *Olympian Odes*, I.-XIV. 177-181, blank. 183, Pindar, *Pythian Odes*, I.-XII. 249, Pindar, *Nemean Odes*, I.-XI. 286, Pindar, *Isthmian Odes*, I.-VII. (II. and III. united). To Pindar are added interlinear glosses and marginal scholia, and here and there metrical treatises and 'arguments.' 296-303^r, blank. 315^v, Pindar, frag. 1 (Christ, 1882).⁴ The manuscript is bound in leather; gatherings are in quinions. Of the writing the Ambrosian Catalogue says 'Manu, ut uidetur, Ioh. Rhosi.'⁵ 'The writing is clear,' says Nigra, *l.c.*, 'and resembles that of the MSS. of Emanuele Mambriano, who lived in the first quarter of the fifteenth century; but it is not by him, being different in some letters.' Contractions are very frequent in both text and scholia. A final uncontracted syllable is often suprascript to the rest of the word (especially α, αι, ας, ε, ες, η, ην, ης, οι, ον, ος, σι, τα, το, ω); and occasionally even so much as -νοῖς, -σαι, -σσοι, -στη is placed thus. *Iota subscr.* is used.

E is the only manuscript of Callimachus which places *Hymn* VI. before V. Between them it sets a non-Callimachean scholium, and V. has the elaborate heading Καλλιμάχου κυρηναίου εἰς λουτρά τῆς παλλάδος:⁶ so it is probable that the inverted order is due to an error of the scribe, especially as *e*, which likewise gives the scholium just mentioned, has the order V. + VI. + scholium, and gives V. the same heading as do most other manuscripts. The scholium, which occurs only in *E* and *e*, is manifestly a note on Lycophron, *Alexandra*, 35, the only extant passage where the present participle passive of the rare φλοιδεῖν occurs. It is not given by G. Kinkel⁷ among the scholia of the *codex Marcianus* of Lycophron, nor by E. Scheer in his collation of all the scholia.⁸ I cite it from *E*'s text, from which *e* differs only in

¹ Cf. g.

² This lame line is found at the end of 11 'Parisian' MSS. of the *Homeric Hymns*; see Allen-Sikes, *ap. crit. to Hymn XXXIII. ad fin.*

³ It occurs also in *H*.

⁴ W. Christ (*Pindari Carmina*, Teubner text, 1899, p. 2) reports that fr. 1 (1 Bergk = 4 Boeckh) is found in *Laur.* XXXII. 52.

See on *BCK* above, p. 6, note 4.

⁶ Contrast εἰς λουτρά τῆς παλλάδος, most *codd.*: ὕμνος εἰς λουτρά τῆς παλλάδος *K*: εἰς Ἀθηνᾶς λουτρά *G*.

⁷ Teubner text, 1880.

⁸ *Lycophronis Alexandra* (Berlin, Weidmann, 2 vols., 1881 and 1908). It also differs from the short comments found in Hesychius, etc., on φλοιδοῦμενος; see Pohl, p. 3, note 2.

punctuation and in the bracketed variants: Φλοιδούμενος ἀντὶ τοῦ βρασσό-
μενος καὶ ἐψόμενος. ἐτυμολογεῖται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν δύο τούτων, τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐψήσεσιν
εἰωθότων συμβαίνειν. ἐκεῖ γὰρ τὸ ἐν τῷ λέβητι ὕδωρ οἰδεῖσθαι πέφυκεν [-ε·] τοῦ
πυρὸς οὐκ ἐῶντος μένειν αὐτὸ κατὰ χώραν ἀλλὰ κινουντος καὶ προωθοῦντος, καὶ
εἰς φλυκταίνας καὶ πομφόλυγας [-λγγας] ἀνεγείροντος¹ πνεύματος τινὸς τῇ βίᾳ
συμπαιρεσδνομένου καὶ φυσῶντος αὐτὸ καὶ οἰδοῦντος· καὶ ποῖος [ποιός] τις ἡχος
φλωῶδης ἡχεῖται ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἡ φλωξ [φλῶξ] παρωνόμασται καὶ ὁ φλοῖσβος· ἀπὸ
τοίνυν τῶν δύο τούτων τοῦ τε φλωῶδους ἡχου καὶ τῆς οἰδήσεως συνθέτως γίνεται
τὸ φλοιδούμενος. Apparently the common source of *E* and *e*, or some more
remote ancestor, finished the *Hymns* on the verso of one folio, and began the
Alexandra on the recto of the next; and the scribe, having no room for this
scholium on the latter page,² or having overlooked it, fitted it into a space at
the end of the former, following the end of the *Hymns*.

Of the earliest collation of *E* Schneider says: '*Hunc codicem primus cum Graeviana contulit Claudius Sallierius in Ruhnkenii gratiam qui varias lectiones cum Ernestio communicavit postea editas in Ruhnkenii, Valckenarii et aliorum ad I. A. Ernestium epistolis p. 92 seq. ed. Tittmann.*'³ Ruhnken doubted, and O. Schneider disproved, the accuracy of this collation;⁴ it was also very scanty—a point in which Blomfield's citations, perhaps derived from Ernesti, do not better it. Pohl's work is both extensive and almost invariably accurate.⁵

The close kinship of *E* and *e* is shown by the following list of passages where they agree against the other manuscripts:

<i>Ee.</i>	<i>cett.</i>
I. 92 τίς μὲν	τίς (τίς) κεν
II. 63 ὑπερβάλλετο	ὑπεβάλλετο : ἐπεβάλλετο
110 δαοῖ	δηοῖ
III. 8 ἔα	ἔα : ἐὰ : the word omitted
87 ἔκετο <i>e</i> : ἔκετο <i>E</i>	ἔκεο
244 νέβρεα	νέβρεια : νεύρεια
251 ἀλλαπαζέμεν	ἀλαπαζέμεν (-άξιμεν)
251 ἀπείλησεν	ἡπείλησε : <i>x</i> omit
IV. 10 κἄν . . .	κάνθιον : καύριος : καύθιος : καίριος
21 ἐπενάξατο	ἐπενήξατο
39 ὄφρα μὲν ⁶	τόφρα μὲν : ζεῦρα μὲν
52 ἀντημοικόν	ἀντημοιβόν : ἀντιμοιβόν

¹ *E*'s third letter may be either *e* or *α* : *e* has *avey*.

² The scholia of *cod. Marcianus* on ll. 1-34 are numerous, filling two pages of Kinkel's edition.

³ *Praef.* XXXI.

⁴ Tittmann, *Epist. Ruhn. Valch. al.*, pp. 39-40, cited by Pohl, p. 2; O. Schneider, *De locis quibusdam Callimachi lacunosis* (*Philologus*, 1851, p. 512), referred to by Pohl, p. 1.

⁵ *Ad Callimachi hymnos et ad Graeca illorum scholia Parisiensium codicum duorum varias lectiones*

enotavit G. Pohl (Posen, 1860). His touchstones were the Tauchnitz (1829) edition for the *Hymns*, and Ernesti's for the scholia; his citations from the *Hymns* number nearly 440. Of fourteen mistakes in *E*, which he attributes to the '*socordia et ignorantia librarii*,' seven, occurring also in *e*, must be ascribed to their common source, and indicate the fidelity, not the defects, of the writer of *E*.

⁶ *e* owes *o* to correction, and a space is left before it, in which *τ* probably stood.

83
96
135
278
306
V. 27
106
108

VI. 54
97
137

To the
which oc
Some
their clos

IV. 35
52
63
V. 58
VI. 34
59
138

That

I. 55
II. 9
II. 22
III. 38

90
184
259
IV. 111
195
319

¹ Probably
from the rest

	<i>Ee</i>	<i>cett.</i>
	83 ἐγένοντοτε δρύες (by haplography)	ἐγένοντο τότε δρύες
	96 τέκεα	τέκνα
	135 καὶ	δὲ
	278 ἀφιετεῖς	ἀμφιετεῖς
	306 ποδὸν	ποδιὸν : ποδὶ
V. 27 omit	ὦ ¹	have ὦ
	106 ὠφειλόμενον	ὀφειλόμενον
	108 πολλὰ	πόσσα : πάσσα : πᾶσσα ; or omitted
VI. 54 στεναγὸν (στεγανὸν in marg. <i>E</i>)	στεγανὸν	στεγανὸν
	97 ποσειδάωνα	ποσειδάωνα
137 ἄρ + space of four letters + κείνος <i>E</i>	{ ἄ + space of some six letters + κείνοσ : ἄρσ' ἐκείνος : ἄροσ' ἐκείνος : ἄρεισ' ἐκείνος : ἄρα.σ' ἐκείνοσ	{
ἄρ + space of two or three letters + κείνος <i>e</i>		

To these must be added *Ee*'s scholium (after *Hymn VI.*), mentioned above, which occurs in them alone.

Some minor peculiarities, found only in *Ee*, strengthen this impression of their close relationship :

	<i>Ee</i>	<i>cett.</i>
IV. 35 οὐκέθλιψεν	οὐκ (οὔκ) ἔθλιψεν	
52 οὔνομ'	οὔνομ'	
63 ἐπιθρήκος	ἐπὶ θρήκος (κρήκος)	
V. 58 περιδῆ	περὶ (πέρι) δῆ	
VI. 34 ἄραι	ἄραι : αὔραι	
59 ἡμθυήτες (ἡμ- <i>e</i>)	ἡμθυήτες	
138 μεγακρείουσα	μέγα κρείουσα	

That *e* is not a copy of *E* will be seen from the following citations :

	<i>e</i>	<i>E</i>
I. 55 ἡέξεν	ἡέ ζεῦ	
II. 9 and IV. 8 ὅστις	ὅστις	
II. 22 ἄλγεα	δάκρυα	
III. 38 κωμοὶ τε	κῶμοι τε (marg. βωμοὶ : βωμοὶ τε <i>cett.</i>)	
90 τὴν δ'	τὴν δ'	
184 νυμφέων	νυμφῶν	
259 χαίρεφραι	χαῖρέφερα	
IV. III λισσόμεναι	λίσσομαι	
195 εἰσεθέλουσα	εἰσελθούσα	
319 λαίφη	λέφη	

¹ Probably *Ee*'s source had ὦ in different ink from the rest of the line ; cf. some members of the *z* group *passim*.

	<i>e</i>	<i>E</i>
V. 35	ἀ	omits ἀ
58	ἐταρᾶν	ἐταιρᾶν
107	πάσσα	πᾶσα
VI. 11	omits τὰ, with gap of two or three letters	omits τὰ, but without gap
70	δάματρα	δάμαρτα

Nor was *E* copied from *e* :

	<i>E</i>	<i>e</i>
I. 26	πολύστειβόν (marg. πολύστειον)	πολύστειόν
II. 22	δάκρυα	ἄλγεα
III. 127	βληταὶ	κληταὶ
256	αὐτὸς	αἰγὸς
V. 52	μὴ οὐκ	μ' οὐκ
78	θεμιτὰ	θεμιτ (sic)
117	δ' before ἐρέει	omits δ'
129	εὔτε θάνη	εὖ δὲ θάνη
VI. 19	δράγματα	δράγμα

That the two manuscripts are copies of a common parent is highly probable from the passages, already noted, where they agree against all the others. Nor are any of their divergences from each other inconsistent with such a theory. Of 158 major differences,¹ 69 are due to the weakness of *E*, and 26 to that of *e*, with three ties; conjecture on *E*'s part probably accounts for 42; 11 seem due to variants or corrections, 4 to abbreviations, and 1 (dubiously) to a gloss, in the common parent; the remaining 2 illustrate *e*'s superiority to *E* in representing the tradition. Cases of weakness in either manuscript need not be detailed; but the other classes deserve notice :

(a) *Readings, most of them peculiar to E, that seem due to his conjecture* :²

I. 26 πολύστειβόν (marg. πολύστειον) *E* : πολύστειόν *cett.*, *ed. fr.*

The rare word may have puzzled the scribe.

74-5 αἰχμῆς. | ὦν ἐρέτης, ὦν πάντα δίδου κρατέοντος ὑπ' ἰσχὺν *E* : τίδος *S* (marg. διός) and *Q*, τίδου *II*, τίδο. *κρ-ε* : τί (τὶ *F*) δ' οὐκ *ed. fr. z.*

SQIIe's readings show the obscurity of the common ancestor of them and *E*.

76 ὑδείοιμεν *E* : ὑδείομεν *cett.*, *ed. fr.*

Perhaps *E* took αὐτίκα as 'Straightway' and the sentence as an exhortation.

¹ There are also 211 minor cases, comprising 144 of accent, 26 of word-division, 17 of use or omission of *iota subscript*, 16 of breathing, and 8 of punctuation.

² Add I. 10, where *E* attains παρασίη by correction (παρασίη *e codd.*); so do *C* and *S*, but *E* elsewhere shows no indebtedness to either.

- II. 4 ἐπέπνευσεν (marg. ἐπένευσεν) E: ἐπένευσεν cett., ed. *pr.*

31 ἔστι γὰρ εὐνυμός τις ἀν' οὔρεα φοῖβος αἶδιδεν E.

Since Auratus restored ἀν οὐ ρέα the line runs ἔστι γὰρ εὐνυμός· τίς ἀν οὐ ρέα Φοῖβον αἶδιδι; All manuscripts omit the stop before τις, and all but E read αἶδιδι, or αἶδει, or αἶδει: EHI with ed. *pr.* alone give ἀν' οὔρεα, F has ἀν' οὔρεα, cett. ἀν οὔρεα. E's first reading ingeniously gives a line intelligible in itself, though not coherent with l. 30; his suprascript records the reading of his source.

104 αἶδει E, with HIBr: αἶδιδι or αἶδει cett., ed. *pr.*

109 Is ὕδασι (ὕδατι cett., ed. *pr.*) conjecture or error?

- III. 38 κῶμοι τε (marg. βῶμοι) E: κῶμοι τε *e*, βῶμοι τε cett., ed. *pr.*

β- misread produced κ- in the parent; *e* reproduces scrupulously, E 'corrects,' and adds βῶμοι in his margin on further inspiration.

41 λευκὸν ἔπι κρηταῖον ὄρος E: ἐπικρ- *e*: ἐπὶ cett., ed. *pr.*

E's reading would suit Λευκὸν, for the arguments against which see Schneider's note.

57 τρινακίης κανῶν (marg. τρινακρίης) E: τρινακίσι κανῶν *e*, τρινακίησι κανῶν Q (-ησι) Π, τρινακίησι κανῶν SF, τρινακίη σικανῶν *x* ed. *pr.*, τρινακρίη σικανῶν HAI Br.

E tries to make the best of the inherited misdivision, not divining the nature of the error.

80 προσελέξατο E: προσελέξατο cett., ed. *pr.*

E's emendation is right.

87 ἴκετο E: ἴκετο *e*: ἴκεο cett., ed. *pr.*

A successful emendation of parental ἴκετο.

102 κεράων δ' ἐπελάμπετο χρυσός E: ἀπελάμπετο cett., ed. *pr.*

Cett. are supported by χάρις δ' ἀπελάμπετο πολλή (Il. XIV. 183; Od. XVIII. 298).

125 λοιμὸς E with GHI: λιμὸς cett., ed. *pr.*

E's ο between λ and ι is small, and is clearly a later insertion, in what hand it is difficult to determine.

154 κικλήσκουσιν E: κικλήσκωσιν F (and marg. of T): κικλήσκουσιν cett., ed. *pr.*

Schneider, in his note *ad loc.*, attributes the suprascript to E's conjecture.

184 νυμφῶν E: νυμφέων cett., ed. *pr.*

E seems to reject purposely an unfamiliar form.

192-3 ἥ δ' ὅτε μὲν λασίησιν ὑπὸ δρυσὶ κρύπτετο νύμφη | ἄλλοτε δ' εἰαμένησιν E: ὅτε also I: ὅτε cett., ed. *pr.*

ὅτε is an improvement on ὅτε, and is probably E's independent correction.

- IV. 16-18 ἀλλά οἱ οὐ νεμεσητὸν ἐνὶ πρώτῃσι λέγεσθαι|ὀππότ' ἐς ὠκεανὸν τε καὶ
ἐς τιθηνίδα (sic) τηθὺν|νήσοι ἀολλίζονται αἰεὶ δ' ἔξαρχος ὀδεύη E :
ὀδεύοι G : ὀδεύει cett., ed. fr.

142 κατουδαίοιο E : κατ' οὐδαίοιο cett. (but GHI omit 142-3).

E's correction is necessary.

152 Is χάριτος δὲ σοι ἔσσει' ἀμοιβή (τοι cett., ed. fr.) conjecture or graphical error?

181 ἀπανγάζονται φάλαγγας (?) E : φάλαγγες cett., ed. fr.

The photograph of E shows a correction, but whether of -ες to -ας or vice versa it is almost impossible to determine. An accus. is needed.

195 τῇ με φέροις, κείνην γὰρ ἐλεύσεται εἰσελθοῦσα E : εἰσεθέλουσα cett.,
whence εἰσεθέλουσαν of ed. fr., improved by its copy d to εἰς
ἐθέλουσαν.

205 ἥ δ' ἄκρητον ἄλῃς ἀπεπαύσατο λυγρῆς E : ἄλυτον GHI, ἄρητον cett.,
ἄρρητον ed. fr.

298 παῖδες δὲ θέρος τὸ πρῶτον ἰούλων E : ἰούλω cett., ed. fr.
ἰούλων is required.

316 πολύλλιτε^{στ} E : πολύλιτε HIBr : πολύλλιτε cett., ed. fr.

E's suprascript would be unmetrical here.

- V. 20 ἔβλεψεν E Politian ed. fr. : ἔκλεψαν S (later corrected to ἔβλεψεν)
Q, ἔβλεψαν cett.

E's correction is required, as only Athene is referred to.

24-5 οἷα παρ' εὐρώτα (i.e. εὐρώτα, which ed. fr. gives with -αι) τοὶ
λακεδαιμόνιοι | ἀστέρες E : οἷά περ or οἷα (οἷα) περ and εὐρώται or
εὐρώται cett. : οἷα παρ' Politian, and (thence) S's margin.

27 Both E and e start the even lines of this *Hymn* further to the right
than the odd ones; and the first letter of E's odd lines is spaced
a letter's width from its successors. Here e indicates an initial
omission (where cett., Politian, and ed. fr. give ὦ) by starting
l. 27 with κόραι just under χρίματα (l. 26) and just above ἡ
(l. 28); but E, not noticing the defect in the parent manuscript,
begins *more suo* with a detached κ, and, lacking a comma after
κόραι, has replaced that word by κόραις to suit the following
clause τὸ δ' ἔρευθος ἀνέδραμε.

52 μὴ οὐκ E : μ' οὐκ e, μ' οὐκ cett., ed. fr. : μ οὐκ Politian.

61 and 63 ἡ' πὶ κορωνείαν E : ἡ' πὶ κορωνείας cett., Politian, ed. fr.

78 θεμιτὰ E with FGHAIBr : θεμιτ (sic) e : θέμιδες II, Politian, ed. fr. :
the word omitted S (at first) and xQ.

E seems to have emended the defective reading of the parent,
mirrored in e's defect.

107 πᾶσα E : πᾶσσα eS, πᾶσσα Q, ὅσσα II Politian, πόσσα (correctly)
ed. fr. FHIBr : the word omitted x.

E's n
primary
codd.); IV
ἀφείλεο (v
ἐσσηνα (ἐ
ἐσσηνα cet
and VI. 5
To su
a readable
(e.g. that
(III. 80;
attains the

(b) P

I. 88

¹ Possibly
by cett.'s sou
κυρίως ὁ βασιλ

² At III. 5
conjecture to
πρόσω with
with this san
seven places.

117 *E* alone follows *ὀλβίσταν* with *δ'*, which, though omitted by Wilamowitz, is needed to bind *ἐρέει* to *λεξέται* (I. 116).

VI. 38 *τῷ* (i.e. *τῷ*) *δ'* *ἐπι ταὶ νύμφαι* . . . *ἐψιώντο* (marg. *ἐτιόντο*, changed from *ἐστιόντο*) *E* : *ἐπὶ* (*ἐπι ed. pr.*) and *ἐψιώντο* (with *ed. pr.*) *cett.*, except *ἐτιόντο eII*.

Seemingly the parent of *E* and *e* had something which both finally read as *ἐτιόντο*. *e* keeps this; *E* emends, but records the source's text in his margin. The corruption, however far back it arose, was doubtless due to *ψ* with a shallow cross-stroke (cf. *A*'s *ἐπεσκέταντο* sic for *ἐπεσκέψαντο*, IV. 43). *ἐπι* is clearly right.

61 *ἀναγκαία E*, -αία, *ed. pr.* : *ἀναγκαῖαι e cett.*

E is nearer the correct reading of *ed. pr.*

95 *χ' ὦ* (for *χῶ*) *μαστός τὸν ἔπωνε E* : *ἔπυνε H*, *ἔπιγε ed. pr. GIBr*, *ἔπωνε cett.*

Is *E*'s suprascript a false aorist form, based on *πέπωκα*, and introduced through distrust of the unfamiliar impf. with *-πω*?

132 *αὐτᾶν E* correctly : *αὐτὰν cett.*, *ed. pr.*

134 *ἐν δ' ὁμοιοία E* : *δ' cett.*, *τ' ed. pr.*

τ' prepares the way for *θ'*, which is better than *δ'* in view of *ἐν τ' εὐηπελία* (135), and was read by *L* and the Vascosanian editor.

E's margin thrice gives readings which are not found in any of the other primary manuscripts, and are correct—viz., III. 69 *κεχριμένος* (*κεχρημένος codd.*); IV. 298, *παρθενικαῖς* (adopted by Wilamowitz; -ικαὶ *codd.*); and V. 87, *ἀφείλεο* (with Politian and *ed. pr.* : -ετο *codd.*). It also better *Ee* at I. 66, *ἔσσηνα* (*ἐς σήνα*, with four strokes underneath, *E* : *ἔσσηνα eII* : *ἐς σήνα F* : *ἔσσηνα cett.*); III. 38, *βωμοὶ* (*κῶμοι E*, *κωμοὶ e*, see above p. 117 : *βωμοὶ cett.*); and VI. 54, *στεγανὸν* (*στεναγὸν Ee* : *στεγανὸν cett.*).²

To sum up, *E* gives the impression of a scholar who is anxious to present a readable text, and is consequently prone to make emendations, some of which (e.g. that at II. 31) show no little insight and ingenuity, and in five of which (III. 80; IV. 298; V. 52, 117; VI. 132)³ he alone among the primary scribes attains the true reading.

(b) *Putative variants or corrections in the parent manuscript :*

I. 88 *νοήσει E* with *HIBr* : *νοήση e* with *xII ed. pr. F* : *νοήσει* (all in the same ink) *SQ* : *νοήσοι G*.

¹ Possibly an archetypal misdivision, corrected by *cett.*'s sources from the scholium here : *ἔσσηνα κυρίως ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν μελισσῶν κτλ.*

² At III. 57 *E*'s margin emends *τρινακίης* of his conjecture to *τρινακίης* : at III. 240 it annotates *πρόλην* with *πρόλην* (? *πρύχην* : the word occurs, with this same doubt, in his text at I. 52). In seven places *E*'s margin = *e*'s text ; viz. thrice in

correcting *E*'s own text (II. 6, *ἀνακλινεσθε* : II. 8, *χορὸν* : V. 3, *εὐτυχος*), thrice in recording the reading of his source beside his own conjecture (I. 26, *παλίστειον* : II. 4, *ἐπέρευεν* : VI. 38, *ἐτιόντο*), and at III. 78 (*κέρων*, the alternative which *E* did not choose from the source's doublet).

³ Add the three *marginalia* just noted ; V. 24-5, and VI. 38 ; and perhaps IV. 181.

Perhaps the parent of *Ee* gave with *SQ* νοήσει⁷, from which each chose differently. (For *G*'s optative see below).

- II. 50 τελέθει^{oi} *E*: τελέθ^{oi} *e* with *xSQIF*: τελέθει *GHI**Br*, *ed. pr.*

E's doublet probably comes from the parent, from which *e* took -oi as a correction.

- III. 78 κόρσην (marg. κόρσιν) *E*: κορ^{σιν} *e*: κόρση^η *S*, κόρσιν^η (all in the same ink) *Q*: κόρσην *ed. pr.*, *cell.*¹ except II, from which ll. 66-145 are missing.

The parent may have had κόρσην, *e* accepting the suprascript as a correction, *E* recording it in his margin as a variant. The doublet could have arisen at an earlier stage either (1) from confusion between the contractions $\Lambda (= \eta\nu)$ and $\Lambda (= \iota\nu)$; or (2), and perhaps more probably, from an ancestor's miswriting a choice between accus. and dat. (κόρσην) as κόρσην. The inversion of this latter in *S* may have arisen as *q*'s παλυξὼ probably did at VI. 77 (see above, p. 74 note 2).

- 232 ἐλένη *E* with *x ed. pr.* (-ηι) *z*: ἐλέλη *S* (later corrected to -ένη) *eII*: ἐλέλη (but *v* in lighter ink) *Q*, ἐλέλη *q*.

Here the parent may have offered ἐλέλη, in which event *e*'s choice would be a parallel to *q*'s selection from *Q*.

- IV. 111 λίσσομαι *E*: λισσόμεναι *e* with *xSQ ed. pr.* *z*: λίσσόμεναι (sic, with first accent cancelled) *II*.

Perhaps *y* (the common ancestor of *x*, *S*, *II*, *D*, *E*, and *e*) had λίσσομαι^{ov}, which reached *II* (who corrects the accent) and *y*² (the ancestor of *E* and *e*) in the same form, but was corrected by *y*³ (the ancestor of *x* and *S*). *E* disregards the caret-mark (as at V. 13), and, inferring a choice between λίσσομαι and λίσσομεν, prefers the former.

- 132 εἰλήθ^{ει}ναιαν *E*: εἰλήθ^{ει}ναιαν *eSQF*: εἰλείθ^{ει}ναιαν *GHI**Br*: εἰλήθ^{ει}ναιαν *xII ed. pr.*

Had the parent *E*'s reading? If the archetype offered this choice, as is probable, *xII ed. pr.*'s reading is explicable on the assumption that, at some intermediate stage, εἰλήθ^{ει}ναιαν became by error εἰλήθ^{ει}ναιαν, whence the *uox nihili* εἰλήθ^{ει}ναιαν.

- 150 κοιη^ς *E*: κοιη^ς (but with two dots under second κ) *e*: κοιη^ς *ed. pr.* and most *codd.* (κηκίης *G*, κηκ^ι . . . *H*, κηκίς *IBr*).

Probably *e* has faithfully reproduced the parent's reading, while *E* accepts the correction it offers, which may have resulted from a

¹ Nigra, *lib. cit.*, XX. (1892), p. 228, cites κόρση from *T*'s margin.

² See T. W. Greek Manuscripts

comparison of the scholium here: *κοίου γὰρ καὶ φοίβης θυγάτηρ λητώ.*

203 *ὅ,τι τοι E: ὅ τοι or ὅ,τοι (e) cett.* (except *G's ὅτι*, if Schneider cites it correctly), and *ed. pr.*

Here *ὅ,τι* in the parent will explain *E's* reading, which is unmetrical.

V. 13 *ἄχαιῖδες E* with *CSQGHAI Br: ἀχαιάδες e* with *A* Politian *ed. pr. F:*

ἄχαιῖδες Π.

The parent (and ultimately the archetype) may have had *ἄχαιῖδες*; then *E*, neglecting the caret-mark (as at IV. 111) and thinking *a* an alternative to *ι*, chose the latter.

14 *ὑπαξόνιον ES* Politian: *ὑπαξονίων e* with *x ed. pr. z (e alone has as*

superscript, in the text-hand, the gloss *γρ' ὑπαξόνιον): ὑπαξόνιον* (the superscript in different ink) *Q: ὑπαξονίω Π.*

Probably the parent had *e's* text and gloss, *E* preferring the latter.

Did the archetype offer a choice?

VI. 114 *τόθ' ὁ (by correction from τότ' ὁ) E: τὸτ' ὁ A: τότ' ὁ e* with *SQ*

ed. pr. F: τότ' ὁ Π: τόθ' ὁ C: τόθ' ὁ I Br: τόθ' . . . H.

Here again the parent (and the archetype) perhaps gave *τότ' ὁ*.

(c) *Putative abbreviations in the parent manuscript:*

I. 52 *πρύλην E* with *Π: πρύλ (= -ιν) e: πρύλιν cett., ed. pr.*

Probably *e* keeps the parent's abbreviation, which *E* misreads (cf. remarks on III. 78 above, p. 120).

II. 52 *βοσκομέναις (in full) E: βοσκομεν' (= -ης) e: βοσκομένης or -ης cett., ed. pr.*

The parent probably had *e's* contraction, which *E* seems to have confused with " (= *αις*).

IV. 212 *βαρύνης E: βαρύνεις e cett., ed. pr.*

This divergence perhaps arose from *βαρύν* (= *-εις* or *-ης*)¹ of the parent.

V. 139 *ὀλολυγαῖς E cett., ed. pr.: ὀλολυγες e.*

The parent probably had *ὀλολυγ'* (" = *-αις* or *-ες*).²

(d) *A gloss (?) in the parent manuscript:*

II. 22 *καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται δάκρυα πέτρος E: ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος e cett., ed. pr.*

E alone gives the unmetrical *δάκρυα*. The parent may have had it in the margin, or as a superscript to *ἄλγεα*. But *e's* silence is noteworthy, and no manuscript has more than *ὑπερτίθεται* (on

¹ See T. W. Allen, *Notes on Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts* (1889), pp. 12-14.

² *Id.*, *ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

ἀναβάλλεται) by way of scholium here; and perhaps δάκρυα should rather be ascribed to the influence of δακρύοις, earlier in the line.

(e) *Other notabilia*:

III. 259 χαῖρέφερα E: χαῖρεφεραι e: χαῖρε φεραι S, whence χαῖρε φεραιὰς (all in the same ink) Q, whence in turn χαῖρε φερήας q: χαῖρε φεραιὰς Π: χαῖρε φεραιή cett., ed. *pr.*

e may have found the parent manuscript in a less worn condition than did E.

VI. 11 καὶ ὅπα τὰ χρύσεια μᾶλα Π ed. *pr.* F: δὲ for τὰ SQ: all cett. omit δὲ, x stopping with καὶ ὅ.

On this line see the section on the lacunae of x. E and e both omit τὰ, the former leaving no gap, the latter a space of two or three letters; that is, E has aimed at concealing the defect and presenting a seemingly flawless text, while e shows characteristic fidelity to their common source.

M. T. SMILEY.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

(To be continued.)

AD TIBVLLI *EL.* I. 4, 41-44.

F. W. HALL, uiro doctissimo, L. CASTIGLIONI S.P.D.

POST Martios labores, uir ornatissime, cum ad nostra studia redissem, in Ephemeride quam tu et docte et diligenter regis a. 1917, p. 131, Jac. Wageningeni coniecturam legi ad Tibulli *EL.* I. 4, 41-44 'uenturam alliciat imbrifer arcus aquam.' Quam difficile, immo Herculei laboris simillimum sit ueteres auctores coniectura tentando superiorum uel conamina uel commenta imprudentem non repetere, qui iisdem saepe me ludis oblectauerim, probe scio. Longe igitur a me reprehendendi uirum egregium consilium abesse profiteor, sed quae ille dixit iam alii dixerunt: 'alliciat' Antonio Zingerle placuit, qui 'uenturam alliciat nimbifer arcus aquam' ut editores scriberent suadere studuit; 'uenturam alliciat nimbifer arcus aquam' paucis uerbis, sed non inepte, puto, collato Vergili uersu *Georg.* I. 380, ipse (*Analecta, Studi Italiani di Filol. Class.* XII., 1904, p. 314) commendauit.

Sed quid plura? Non ut de paruola tecum coniectura pugnarem, sed ut, occasione oblata, quantum docta uestra mihi studia placeant quibusque uotis ea omnia quae nobis pariter et uobis cordi sunt prosequar, hoc ad te epistolum mittere audeo.

Vale, uir doctissime, mihiq̄ faueas.

Scripsi Asti, postr. Non. Jun. MCMXX.

HOMERICA.

Π 158. οἳ τ' ἔλαφον κεραὸν μέγαν οὔρεσι δηφόντες δάπτουσιν.

THE Myrmidons going out to war are compared to a pack of wolves going to drink after they have devoured a deer; see the following lines; they are not like wolves which 'are devouring' it. Hence δάπτουσιν looks wrong, and is probably a corruption of δάψουσιν, the old aorist subjunctive; this being taken for a future would infallibly be altered. In any case ψ and πτ are not infrequently confused; thus in 161 λάπτοντες is a variant for λάψοντες.

T 88. οἳ τέ μοι εἰν ἀγορῇ φρεσὶν ἔμβαλον ἄγριον ἄτην
 ἥματι τῷ ὅτ' Ἀχιλλῆος γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπηύρων.
 ἀλλὰ τί κε ῥέξαιμι; θεὸς διὰ πάντα τελευτᾷ.
 πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ ἄτη, ἥ πάντας ἀᾶται.

This passage has never been properly explained, nor can it be until we have removed the stop after ἀπηύρων and put go into a parenthesis. The construction is ἔμβαλον ἄτην, ἄτη ἥ ἀᾶται. By the usual Homeric custom a word so repeated is repeated in the nominative; ἄτην ἄτη ἥ is very like an English idiom, as *Ring and Book*, iii. 547:

Or let *him* share the mat with the mastiff, *he*
Who lived large and kept open house so long.

The interruption of the sentence by the parenthesis and the general halting effect of the whole passage is characteristic of the state of the King's mind as revealed throughout his speech.

Ω 382. ἄνδρας ἐς ἀλλοδάπους, ἵνα περ τάδε τοι σόα μίμνη.

It has been debated whether ἵνα here means 'in order that' or 'where.' But ἵνα περ cannot mean 'in order that'; it is a very common conjunction and never means anything but 'where.' The only exception, I believe, is in a false quotation of ψ 84 by Aeschines, 'quoting a text which agreed with the early Ptolemaic papyri.'¹ We might as well expect to find ὥσπερ used as a final conjunction. But neither can ἵνα περ here mean 'where,' because ἵνα μίμνη is no better Greek for 'where they may abide' than ὅπου μίμνη would be. Hence we are driven to accepting, as Bekker did, the variant ἵνα τοι τάδε περ. And we must do the same at v. 364, though there is scarcely any support there for the right reading.

¹ Grenfell in *J.H.S.* vol. xxxix. p. 18.

Ω 514. καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ' ἥμερος ἥδ' ἀπὸ γυίων.

Advanced civilization may have a hundred merits, but it makes people unable, it seems, to understand the expression of the emotions which is familiar to primitive man. Homer surpasses, perhaps, all other poets in this respect, and the Alexandrines were perhaps the least likely of mortals to appreciate his touches of nature. At T 365, the teeth of Achilles chatter as he arms himself, and the passage was obelized, γελοῖον γὰρ τὸ βρυχᾶσθαι τὸν Ἀχιλλέα. As if rage did not cause every muscle to tremble! See the essay on *Hate* at the end of Shipley's miscellaneous volume entitled *Studies in Insect Life*, etc. If this simple passage so troubled them, it is no wonder that they protested against 'yearning departing from the limbs' of Achilles, and a number of distinguished modern scholars have agreed with them.

Yet I believe that Homer did say this and that he knew what he was about. Violent grief does affect the limbs. Darwin is principally occupied with the facial expression in his discussion in the *Expression of the Emotions*, but he also calls attention to the wringing of the hands and general restlessness and desire for violent physical exertion which attend upon it. In this case, however, Achilles remains seated. In trying to find out something about this point, I was met by an unexpected difficulty: hardly anybody is able to assume the aspect of the emotions at will, and I could only get one or two out of many to give me any help. But I happen to be one of those fortunate persons myself, and had better, perhaps, describe my own experience, like the Platonic Socrates in *Phaedo*, which is confirmed more or less by that of others.

If, then, I imagine myself to be in vehement grief, I find that my fists are clenched, my arms brought against my sides, the fore-arms being bent inwards and upwards at an acute angle so that the hands approach towards the chin; in fact there is a violent contraction of the muscles in the arm (as also in the breast). This is true to a very much smaller extent of certain muscles in the legs. It is this to which Homer refers, and the line means in modern language 'when his sorrow was soothed and the physical tension relaxed.' There is a slight zeugma, but Homer has many much stronger instances of zeugma. The phrase is therefore quite like ἀπὸ δέος εἴλετο γυίων; in one case the trembling, in the other the tension, are the bodily signs of the mental state.

Ω 795. καὶ τὰ γε χρυσεῖην ἐς λάρνακα θῆκαν ἐλόντες,
πορφυρέοις πέπλοισι καλύψαντες μαλακοῖσιν.

'According to Studniczka,' says Leaf, 'the covering was put over the coffin, not wrapped round the bones inside it.' Studniczka, then, is like some other archæologists; he thinks that you may defy grammar on the strength of a pot. Homer says here plainly enough that they first wrapped the bones in cloths and then put them into the coffin, unless, indeed, we are to translate καλύψαντες 'and then covered it up.'

Then
right, bec
day,' the

The
much for
however,

I am extr
to be the
proposed
αὐτως μυθ
spoil the t

But t
suppose λ
supported
the return
is here ta
'on the ε
καὶ νέα of
mysteriou
moon, mo

Ω 802. εὖ συναγειρόμενοι δαίνυντ' ἔρικνδεα δαῖτα.

There is some considerable authority for *συναγειράμενοι*, and this must be right, because only one feast is spoken of. If *δαίνυντο* meant 'feasted every day,' the present participle would be correct. It can hardly be a mixed aorist.

ξ 161. τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεύς.

The ancients took *λυκάβας* to mean 'a year'; Monro *ad loc.* argues with much force that it is really 'a day, or more precisely a *νυχθήμερον*.' This, however, makes it impossible to retain the line here, and 162 has to go with it:

τοῦ μὲν φθίνοντος μηνὸς τοῦ δ' ἵσταμένοιο.

I am extremely loth to give up any part of this passage; to do so seems to me to be the ruin of the effect of the whole speech of Odysseus. When Kirchhoff proposed to eject the whole oath, 158-164, he must have forgotten 151, οὐκ αὐτως μνθήσομαι ἀλλὰ σὺν ὄρκῳ. And if we eject any fewer lines we inevitably spoil the texture of the passage.

But there is a third possibility, hinted at by Monro and van Leeuwen: suppose *λυκάβας* means 'a lunar month'? This view appears to be strongly supported by the language of 162, and it enables us to retain the lines because the return of Odysseus was to be upon the last day of the month in which he is here talking to Eumaeus. A man might well say that a thing will happen 'on the *ἔνη καὶ νέα* of this very month,' but he could neither say 'on the *ἔνη καὶ νέα* of this year,' nor yet 'on this very day, on the *ἔνη καὶ νέα*.' In a mysterious and solemn prophecy it seems natural to refer to the course of the moon, mother of magic and mystery, rather than to any other measure of time.

ARTHUR PLATT.

MISCELLANEA HESIODEA.

I. Χαῖρε, δις ἡβήσας.

IN *Proverb. Vat.* IV. 3 the proverbial 'Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας is somewhat darkly explained as follows: 'Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν 'Ορχομενίων πολιτείᾳ δις τετάφθαι φησὶ τὸν 'Ἡσίοδον καὶ ἐπιγράμματος τοῦδε τυχεῖν.

Χαῖρε, δις ἡβήσας καὶ δις τάφου ἀντιβολήσας,
'Ἡσίοδ', ἀνθρώποις μέτρον ἔχων σοφίης.

Suidas, and Tzetzes in the γένος 'Ἡσιόδου, attribute this epigram to Pindar; and though their authority is not ordinarily of the weightiest, they are almost certainly to be believed in the present case. There is nothing glaringly Pindaric in the couplet to have suggested this ascription; and probably the statement of Suidas and Tzetzes rests upon the authority of the 'Ορχομενίων πολιτεία itself. But internal evidence of a quiet kind supports the alleged Pindaric authorship. ἀντιβολήσας is doubtless used in imitation of δ. 547 σὺ δέ κεν τάφου ἀντιβολήσας, but the verb is Pindaric; see *Ol.* XIII. 43 ἀντεβόλησεν | τῶν ἀνὴρ θνατὸς οὐπω τις πρότερον: and σοφίης (=poësy) is a characteristic Pindaric use, as in *Ol.* I. 187 πρόφαντον σοφία καθ' Ἑλλανας ἔοντα παντῇ (cp. also *Pyth.* IV. 248; VI. 49). I do not recall an exact parallel in Pindar to the phrase μέτρον (σοφίης), but its early use is well established by such examples as Solon, fr. 12, l. 52 (Hiller-Crusius) ἡμερτῆς σοφίης μέτρον ἐπιστάμενος; Theogn. 1119 ἡβης μέτρον ἔχοιμι; and Hesiod, *W. and D.* 131. As will appear, the authorship of this epitaph is of real importance.

The epigram has been something of a puzzle. The phrase δις τάφου ἀντιβολήσας, indeed, gives no trouble: Hesiod—like a popular mediaeval saint—had more tombs than one, Oenoë, Orchomenos, and Ascrea each claiming the poet's relics.¹ But δις ἡβήσας has (so far as I know) baffled interpreters: Marckscheffel,² e.g., thinks that in order to explain two³ tombs of Hesiod, someone feigned that Hesiod had twice lived and twice died; that this story was enshrined in the epigram, and that the epigram was the source of the proverbial 'Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας. In the *Prolegomena*⁴ to his edition Goettling objects to this explanation on the ground that the proverb relates to great age, while δις ἡβήσας indicates renewed life (*de repetita vita*); and considers

¹ Marckscheffel, *Hesiodi . . . Fragmenta*, pp. 28-29.

² *Id.* pp. 53-54.

³ The third claimant to the poet's remains emerged after the age of Pindar, as it appears.

⁴ Pp. xvi-xvii.

that the
tacked o
an expl
referenc
while di

But
'Ἡσιόδει
is based
terms o
means o
(VII. v.

But the
since Pl
the frag
Etym. l
estimate
estimate
Hesiodi
not unli
that he
Roscher
probabl
longer e
years,' o
Ausoni
seems t
posito se
lively, v
Certame
was an
with the
existed
correct,
Hesiod
Stesich

But
life put
¹ Cp. V
² It may
is clearly
'wisdom'
³ This
'Ορχομενί

that the Vatican compiler, failing to understand 'Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας, hopefully tacked on to it the Pindaric epigram, trusting that it might somehow furnish an explanation. In his own view, 'Hesiodic old age' is to be understood by reference to a famous passage from the *Precepts of Chiron* (Rzach, frag. 171), while δις ἡβήσας is tantamount to saying that there were two Hesiods.

But was the Vatican compiler after all so inept as Goettling believes? 'Ἡσιόδειον γῆρας must have been a proverb, for which there was little call if it is based on Hesiod, fr. 171, for that passage estimates the life of the Nymphs in terms of phoenixes, stags, crows, and old men: ἀνδρῶν γηράντων, I take it, means only 'old men' and not 'extremely old men.' Ausonius indeed (VII. v. 1-2, ed. Peiper) gives a figure for the length of the Hesiodic generation:

Ter binos deciesque nouem super exit in annos
iusta senescentum quos implet uita uirorum.

But there can be no doubt that this is an addition by the Roman poet, since Plutarch (*Mor.* 415c), after quoting the Greek text, notes that in l. 2 of the fragment some read ἡβώντος (sc. ἡβώντων), and others γηράντων (γηράντων, *Etym. Magn.*; adopted by Rzach); and that the Hesiodic generation was estimated accordingly at thirty or one hundred and eight years. These estimates could never have been put forward had there been anything in the Hesiodic context to show how many years were assigned to a γενεά. If (as is not unlikely) Ausonius only knew the original from Plutarch, it is probable that he got the material for his first two lines from Plutarch's comment. Roscher's conjecture *ter senos* (for *ter binos*) would in that case be highly probable, as making Ausonius' number of years coincide with Plutarch's longer estimate of one hundred and eight years. However, 'six and ninety years,' or three complete generations, is quite unobjectionable in itself; and Ausonius may have had Nestor in mind. Symmachus¹ (quoted by Rzach) seems to give the true link between proverb and epigram: *Hesiodum ferunt posito senio in uirides annos rediisse*. That is to say, a 'Hesiodic old age' is a lively, vigorous age, in which ἡβη reasserts itself. Now, although neither the *Certamen* nor the γένος 'Ἡσιόδου—I believe—state, or even imply, that Hesiod was an old man at the time of his death, the words of Symmachus, together with the ὁ πρεσβύς of the epigram by Alcaeus of Messena, prove that there existed such a tradition.² If, then, our explanation of δις ἡβήσας is generally correct, Pindar's reference can only be to the alleged intrigue of the aged Hesiod at Oenoë with the girl Clymene who bore him a son, the melic poet Stesichorus:³ in his earlier ἡβη Hesiod had become father of a son Mnaseas.⁴

But why revive this antique scandal? The material for Hesiod's life put before us is of three kinds. The first is (or professes to be)

¹ Cp. VII. 20.

² It may rest mainly on the fact that *W. and D.* is clearly not the work of a young man. Its 'wisdom' is the wisdom of age and experience.

³ This story rests on the authority of the *Ὀρχομενίων Πολιτεία* and of Philochorus. Cly-

mene, however, may be quite mythical, playing the part of the 'injured sister' usual in murder legends: cp. Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, pp. 132 f., on the set type of such legends.

⁴ See Schol. anon. *ad. O. et D.* 272.

autobiographical; the second is furnished by very ancient tradition, the origin and complete validity of which we cannot know; to the third class belong literary inventions and the like. It is to the third class we should naturally relegate the story of the aged Hesiod's romance, but for the fact that it now appears to have been known to Pindar and accepted by him in the earlier half of the fifth century. Later in the same century Thucydides¹ vindicates the place of Hesiod's death and the oracle which foretold it as matter of real tradition; but he says nothing as to why Hesiod was killed. It is something, then, to know that in its main outlines at least the tale of Hesiod's amour is no romantic embellishment invented to pad out late documents like the *Certamen*, but—true or false—a piece of old-established tradition.

II. TWO PASSAGES IN THE *WORKS AND DAYS*.

- (a) ll. 40-1: νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν ὅσφ' πλέον ἤμισυ παντός,
οὐδ' ὅσον ἐν μαλάχῃ τε καὶ ἀσφοδέλῳ μέγ' ὄνειρα.

This couplet has found no favour and little justice at the hands of critics and editors: Rzach—to mention only the latest censor—severely isolates it from the surrounding text. The objections raised by commentators are various and, to say the least, curious. Lehrs,² for example, affirms that the 'kings' should not be called νήπιοι, since it would be too much to expect them to live on mallows and asphodel, and they cannot be thought to have relied solely on their illegal 'court-fees' to avoid 'meatless days': the address (he claims) is really to Perses, foolishly discontented with his modest means. Schoemann regards the lines as a makeshift transition to ll. 42-105. Hetzel³ thinks that the adage 'the half is greater than the whole' might be recommended to Perses, but certainly not to the 'kings'; while the encomium on self-growing vegetable food should not be addressed to either, as being in contradiction to the central theme of the poem 'plough and sow'—νήπιοι, then, is a mere link to connect these lines and the following (all of which are interpolated) with the genuine Hesiodic l. 39. Fick,⁴ again, accepts 40, but rejects 41 on the ground that the older Hellenism was quite free from vegetarian fads and fancies. Occasionally, however, these lines are defended, as by Schoell.⁵ Accepting Schoemann's correction (?) of l. 39 οἱ τῇδε δίκην ἐθέλοντι δικάσαν, he argues that 40-1 are the necessary and almost inevitable copula between 39 and 42: 'the princes gave judgment as you wished, not knowing your true interest which is in moderation and frugality.' Vollbehr⁶ believes the 'half' to be the half of the patrimony legally due to Perses, and that Perses ought to have lived on mallows and asphodel as the times demand, since the gods have hidden from men their means of living.

¹ III. 96.

² *Quaest. Ep.*, p. 224⁶.

³ *De Carm. Hes. quod O. et D. inscr. Comp. et Interp.*, p. 13.

⁴ *Hes. Gedichte*, p. 56.

⁵ *De Pandora Hesiodi* (*Satura philol. H. Sauppio oblata*, p. 140¹).

⁶ *Prolegomena*, p. 27.

That
generally
specific
realized
encomium
these lines

In other
their law
is nothing

The
the assum
scholium
ἐκ τούτου
βρωμάτων
meagre fa
means as
Again a l
Proverbs

So e
(it may b
(κρύψαντο
the two l
had follow
point (ἀγ
What cor

(b)

Lehr
was also
pessimism
Rzach al
digamma
to be that

¹ Cp. Th
ἀλγους συν
χρήματα πα

That 'the half is greater than the whole' is a proverbial saying has been generally recognized, though many seem to attach to it a particular and specific reference to the disputed patrimony as well. Few, if any, have realized that the parallel l. 41 is equally a proverbial expression, and not an encomium on cheap vegetable food. What, then, is the exact meaning of these lines? L. 40 becomes clear directly we compare *Ps. XXXVII. 16*:

A small thing (*ἡμῖς*) that the righteous hath
Is better (*πλέον*) than great riches (*παντός*) of the ungodly.

In other words, the 'kings' do not realize that, since *κακὰ κέρδεα ἴσ' ἀάτησι*, their lawful own is better than an income doubled by ill-gotten gains.¹ There is nothing in this which is inappropriate as addressed to the 'kings.'

The following verse presents no greater difficulty, if we will only banish the assumption that Hesiod is recommending a vegetable diet. Indeed, the *scholium* of Proclus reaches more than half-way towards the true explanation: *ἐκ τούτου (sc. χύλου) οὖν πολλὸν τὸ ὄφελος, καὶ πλεον ἢ τῶν πολυτελεστάτων βρωμάτων ἀπὸ ἀδικίας συλλεγομένων*. Mallows and asphodel were poor and meagre fare. Why, then, does Hesiod say they have great virtue? Surely he means as compared with richer food obtained by 'the reward of iniquity.' Again a Hebrew parallel seems to be to the point: *mutatis mutandis* compare *Proverbs XV. 16-17*:

Better a dinner of herbs where love is
Than a stalled ox and contention therewith.

So explained, ll. 40-41 agree excellently with the preceding verses. But (it may be urged) they do not make any sort of connexion with ll. 42 sqq. (*κρύψαντες γὰρ*, etc.). It is not so. In ll. 11-24 Hesiod unfolds his theory of the two Erides: in ll. 27-44 he commends it earnestly to Perses as one who had followed too eagerly the wrong Eris: in l. 42 he carries on, explaining the point (*ἀγαθὴ δ' Ἔρις ἥδε βροτοῖσι*: l. 24) made just before his apostrophe. What could be more natural?

(b) 270-3: *νῦν δὲ ἐγὼ μῆτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος
εἶην μῆτ' ἐμὸς υἱός· ἐπεὶ κακὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον
ἔμμεναι, εἰ μείζω γε δίκην ἀδικώτερος ἔξει·
ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' οὐ πῶ ἔολπα τελεῖν Δία μητιόεντα.*

Lehrs² regards l. 273 as an interpolation by the incorrigible optimist who was also responsible for l. 179. Steitz³ rejects it as stultifying 270-2, and the pessimism in the description of the Iron Age. Goettling, Koehly-Kinkel, and Rzach all bracket the line. Fick⁴ condemns the line for the neglect of the digamma in *οὐ πῶ FέFολπα*. As to this last, however, the general rule seems to be that digamma was not pronounced, or was in some way modified, if the

¹ Cp. Theognis, ll. 145-6 *βοῦλεο δ' εὐσεβέων
ὀλίγοις συν χρήμασιν οἰκεῖν | ἢ πλουτεῖν ἀδίκως
χρήματα πασάμενος.*

² *Op. cit.*, p. 236.

³ *W. u. T. d. Hes.*, p. 85.

⁴ *Hesiods Gedichte*, p. 47.

long final vowel or diphthong before the digammated word stands in thesis.¹ I do not accept Steitz's stylistic objections to the whole passage: ll. 270-2 seem to be exactly equal in this respect to the opening of the Iron Age (ll. 176 sqq.). The same critic objects to the inconsistency of l. 273 with the gloomy outlook of the Iron Age passage. But it is notoriously difficult for a prophet, whether of good things or evil, to remain equably at the same temperature; and, in the verses following l. 176, Hesiod tells of evils which are to come (but are not yet wholly present), while in l. 273 he says the evil he fears is not likely to happen *yet* (οὐ πω). The charge of inconsistency, then, is ill-founded; nor, if it were substantial, would it go far to condemn l. 273.

Hesiod surely does not mean (as Plutarch² and most modern critics seem to have thought): 'May neither I nor my son be righteous; for it is a sorry thing to be righteous, since the unrighteous get the greater right.' ἐπεὶ κακὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον ἔμμεναι is not in apodosis to εἰ μείζω . . . ἔξει: it is parenthetic, and, in fact, a conditional clause, compressed for vividness, but equivalent to 'for (if this is so) then it is a sorry business,' etc. The real apodosis to εἰ μείζω . . . ἔξει is νῦν δὲ ἐγὼ . . . νίος. If justice and injustice are to change places, Hesiod might safely utter the desire (which so shocked Plutarch) that neither he nor his son might be righteous. Hesiod does not in the least believe that justice and injustice have so changed places; but to say what he would do if such a change were to take place is an effective form of expression. This will also explain—at least partially—l. 273.

The whole passage now under consideration is, indeed, a characteristic reflection of a mind trying to grapple with one of the eternal problems of the universe; and as in the case of ll. 40-41, its integrity can be supported by production of an analogy. In *Psalm* LXXII. the same problem is under consideration:

v. 12: 'Lo, these are the ungodly, these prosper in the world, and these have riches in possession' (cp. εἰ μείζω γε δίκην ἀδικώτερος ἔξει): 'And I said: Then have I cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency,' etc. (cp. νῦν δὲ ἐγὼ . . . εἶην).

The Hebrew poet (unlike Hesiod) gives the stages of his thought on this matter (v. 15). Yet he, too, finds a solution to satisfy his instinct:

vv. 16-17: ' . . . then understood I the end of these men; namely, how thou dost set them in slippery places,' etc.

Exactly parallel is Hesiod's ultimate judgment in l. 273:

'I do not believe that Heaven in its wisdom³ will yet bring it about that the unrighteous shall have advantage of the righteous.'

¹ See Rzach, *Der Dialekt d. Hesiodos*, p. 378.

² See *scholium* of Proclus *ad loc.*

³ *μηρίβερρα* is significant (as the epithets of Zeus so often are), and is supported by the best

evidence (Rzach's S, Ω, Φ and Proclus): the alternative *ρεπυκτέφανρον* rests on the inferior testimony of Ψ, Tzetzes and Moschopoulos.

Im
melic a
content
noted h

(a)
Hunt (C
and to s
col. 2, 1

Compar

(b)
or comp
approxi

seems to

where
Works, I

¹ See R
Enycl. VI
² Rzach

III. TWO IMITATIONS OF HESIOD.

Imitations and echoes of passages from the Hesiodic poems¹ by the earlier melic and elegiac poets are peculiarly valuable as witnesses to the form and content of these works in early days. I do not think the two instances here noted have yet been brought forward in this connexion:

(a) The fragments of Alcaeus lately published by Professors Grenfell and Hunt (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part X., No. 1233) seem to furnish a structural—and to some extent a verbal—imitation of a passage in the *Theogony*. Frag. I., col. 2, ll. 11 sqq., read as follows:

ἀλλ' ἄγε μὴ μεγάλων ἐπ[ιβάλλεο.]
καὶ γὰρ Σίσυφος Αἰολίδαις βασίλειος [ἔφα
ἄνδρων πλείστα νοησάμενος [θάνατον φύγην·
ἀλ[λ]ὰ κα[ὶ] πολυίδρις ἔων ὑπὰ κᾶρι [δὲ
[διν]να[έ]ντ' Ἀχέροντ' ἐπέραισε· μ[έ]γας δέ οἱ
[κάτ]ω μ[ό]χ[θον] ἔχην Κρονίδαις βά[ρυν] ὥρισε
[με]λαίνας χθόνας.

Compare *Theogony*, ll. 614 sqq.:

ὥς οὐκ ἔστι Διὸς κλέψαι νόον οὐδὲ παρελθεῖν·
οὐδὲ γὰρ Ἰαπετιονίδης ἀκάκητα Προμηθεὺς
τοῖο γ' ὑπεξήλυξε βαρὺν χόλον, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀνάγκης
καὶ πολυίδριν ἔοντα μέγας κατὰ δεσμὸς ἐρύκει.

(b) In the case of the rejected and obviously secondary *Hesiodæa*, early or comparatively early testimonia would be specially valuable as a help to approximate dating. A scrap of the *Suitors of Helen*,²

ἤδη δὲ γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
πολλὸν αἰστώσαι,

seems to be imitated by Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vincit*, ll. 234-5:

ἀλλ' αἰστώσας γένος
τὸ πᾶν ἔχρηζεν ἄλλο φιλῦσαι νέον,

where the last three words perhaps betray contaminating influence of *Works*, ll. 137-8, 143.

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.

¹ See Rzach, *Hesiodos* (Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl.* VIII., cols. 1176-7.

² Rzach, fr. 96, ll. 60-61. The imitation (or

loan) is particularly valuable as being derived from the difficult 'Second Book' of the *Suitors* poem, on which see *Class. Quart.* IX., pp. 74 sqq.

VINDICIAE PLATONICAE II.¹

THESE notes have been interrupted by the war, and the appearance of Wilamowitz's *Platon* (Berlin, 1919) makes it desirable to resume them on a slightly different plan. That work has an appendix entitled *Textkritik* (vol. ii., pp. 323 sqq.), which cannot be passed over in silence, since the writer's reputation and the air of authority he assumes might easily mislead those who have no first-hand knowledge of Platonic textual criticism. I hope to show that most of his conjectures are wrong, and that many of them suggest doubts as to his knowledge of Platonic Greek.

Wilamowitz has taken my text as the basis of his criticism, but he has only used my first edition, though vol. i. was reissued in 1905 and vol. ii. in 1910. That accounts for a good many inaccuracies. He says (p. 333, n. 1) that my collations of W are inadequate, and have been shown to be so by Schoene for the *Symposium*, and by Hensel for the *Theaetetus* and *Politicus*. As he refers his readers to my Prefaces (p. 332, n. 3), he has presumably read them, and ought to have known that I never collated W at all or even saw it. Except where the contrary is expressly stated, I had to make use of such information as I could get from Stallbaum and other sources, while, in my second edition, I gratefully made use of the collations by Schoene and Hensel. The really extraordinary thing, as Wilamowitz himself remarks (p. 333), is that the Platonic scholars of Vienna should have neglected their treasure as they did. They neither used W themselves nor made its readings available for others. In fact, it was left for a Czech, the late Professor Král, of Prague, to bring to light once more what is in many ways the most important MS. of the first seven tetralogies.

I now proceed to discuss Wilamowitz's textual notes in detail, prefacing each tetralogy by a statement of the foundation on which the text now rests.

TETRALOGY I.

In this tetralogy Schanz's *editio maior* is almost useless, since it was published before he discovered the independent value of T. Even his generally accurate collation of B is spoilt by his failure to distinguish the contemporary diorthotes (B²) from the later correctors (b). That obscures the important fact that B was corrected as soon as it was written from a MS. closely akin to W. In the *Euthyphro*, *Apology* and *Crito*, the *editio maior* is more than replaced by the school texts which Schanz published in 1887, 1893 and 1888 respectively, as these contain the readings, not only of T, but also of W. At this

¹ See the *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. VIII. (1914), pp. 230 sqq.

point S
history
because
refusal
of the B
criticism
legerit.
nothing
name at
scholars
revised t
from a p
also able
me. Su
a sound

5e, 2
είπον, ὅτι

I ha
and othe
is worse
a senten
explanat
οὕτως ἔχει
I have m
that the

6a, 8

Wil
(BW), b
occurred
fault. S
offends.
saying th
out as a
νέους; (3

35b.

Here
There is
should b
W ὅτι γ
Wilamow
the conv
can only
ὁπρὸν με
not follow
I have n
believe it

point Schanz gave up editing Plato altogether, and confined himself to the history of Roman literature. According to Wilamowitz (p. 335) that was because he could not bring himself to admit his fundamental error (i.e. his refusal to recognize the importance of W). In the Preface to his school text of the *Euthyphro* (1887) Schanz thought proper to say of Král's perfectly just criticisms on this score: *hic conuicia eius silentio obruamus; contemserit ea qui legerit*. I have never noticed any *conuicia* in Král's writings, and certainly nothing like this. So far as I can see, Wilamowitz does not mention Král's name at all, which is another recognized way of dealing with non-German scholars. In any case, whatever the reason may be, Schanz never gave us a revised text of the *Phaedo*, and it was left for me to publish the readings of T from a photograph which I had made for me. In my second edition I was also able to use a full and accurate collation of W which Král generously gave me. Such as it is, then, my text of the *Phaedo* is the only one based on a sound foundation.

EUTHYPHRO.

5c, 2 θέσσαι ὡς μέγα σοι ἐρῶ τεκμήριον τοῦ νόμου ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει—ὁ καὶ ἄλλοις ἤδη εἶπον, ὅτι ταῦτα ὀρθῶς ἂν εἴη οὕτω γινόμενα—μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν κτλ.

I have already defended the text against the corruptions introduced by Schanz and others (*Class. Quart.* VIII., p. 234), but that suggested by Wilamowitz (p. 339) is worse than any of them. He wishes to delete ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει, which leaves us with a sentence that cannot be construed. As Stallbaum saw, μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν κτλ. is explanatory of τοῦ νομοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει (= ὅτι ὁ νόμος οὕτως ἔχει), and if we delete ὅτι οὕτως ἔχει, these words are left hanging in the air. As Stallbaum also saw, the words I have marked as a parenthesis mean 'a proof I have already given to others to show that the course I propose to take is right.'

6a, 8 διδὲ δὴ, ὡς εἰκε, φήσει τίς με ἐξαμαρτάνειν.

Wilamowitz (p. 346) would write ὁ δὴ or ἃ δὴ for the MS. διδὲ δὴ (T) or δι' ἃ δὴ (BW), because 'his unbelief is not the ground but the content of his fault.' It never occurred to me at least that the words were intended to give the 'ground' of his fault. Surely they give the reason why 'it will be said' (φήσει τις) that Socrates offends. The point he professes not to understand is just what Meletus means by saying that he does not recognize the old gods (cf. 3b, 4 ὡς φησιν), and this is thrown out as a possible answer to the question τί καὶ ποιοῦντά σέ φησι διαφθείρειν τοὺς νέους; (3a, 9).

APOLOGY.

35b, 4 τοὺς δοκοῦντας καὶ ὀπρὸν τι εἶναι.

Here ὀπρὸν τι is Heindorf's correction of ὀπρ τι οὖν (BT) or ὀπρτιοῦν (W). There is no valid objection to the form ὀπρτιοῦν (cf. ὀπωστιοῦν), and I suspect that it should be restored in several places (e.g. *Theaet.* 187d, 9, where B has ὀπργοῦν and W ὀπρ γοῦν). On the other hand, τι is essential, and so Bekker printed ὀπρτιοῦν τι. Wilamowitz regards ὀπρ as a mere variant for ὅτι, and writes καὶ ὅτι οὖν εἶναι (i.e., in the conventional spelling, καὶ ὀτιοῦν εἶναι) with some late MSS. and Stallbaum. I can only say that I should miss καὶ ὀπρὸν very much. Cf. *Rep.* 338d, 4 τοὺς καὶ ὀπρὸν μετρίους. Moreover, though we can say τι εἶναι, *esse aliquid*, of persons, it does not follow that we can use ὀτιοῦν εἶναι in the same idiomatic way. At any rate, I have not been able to find an example anywhere of such a usage, and I do not believe it is Greek.

37d, 5 ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης πόλεως ἀμειβομένην καὶ ἐξελαυνομένην ζῆν.

Cobet altered πόλεως to πόλιν, and Bekker read ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης πόλιν πόλεως with one late MS. This Wilamowitz thinks 'a better attempt'! He himself proposes to delete πόλεως and to regard ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης as an instance of 'the free use of the feminine,' which he has discussed in his note on *Herakles* 681 (cf. e.g. *Euthyd.* 273b, 4 ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην ἀποβλέποντες εἰς ἡμᾶς). Really, however, the construction in the text is quite normal. It is clearly undesirable to write πόλεως πόλιν, and, if the noun is only to be expressed once, its case is determined by the principle of accommodation to the nearest construction. Schanz quotes Xen. *An.* V. 4, 31 συνήκουον εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας πόλεως. I may add that this usage survived in late Greek, e.g. Plut. *V. Rom.* 19 μεταγαγεῖν ἀπ' ἄλλων εἰς ἄλλους ἀγῶνας.

41b, 1 ἐπεὶ ἔμοιγε καὶ αὐτῷ θανμαστῇ ἂν εἴη ἡ διατριβὴ αὐτόθι ὅποτε ἐντύχοιμι Παλαμῆδει . . . καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος . . . διὰ κρίσιν ἄδ' ἂν κρίνῃ, ἀντιπαραβάλλοντι τὰ ἑμῶν πᾶσι πρὸς τὰ ἐκείνων—ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι, οὐκ ἂν ἀγρὸς εἴη—καὶ δὴ τὸ μέγιστον, τοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐξετάζοντα διάγειν κτλ.

Wilamowitz remarks that the words οὐκ ἂν ἀγρὸς εἴη break a sentence which would be quite intelligible without them. That is just why I marked them (along with ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι) as a parenthesis. Wilamowitz has hardly any sense of parenthesis, though it is one of the most marked characteristics of Plato's style. What is really amazing, however, is that he boggles at the shift from the dative ἀντιπαραβάλλοντι to the accusative ἐξετάζοντα. It is objectionable 'at least for the style of this work, which must not be treated like the *Laws*'! Of course the shift is quite normal. Cf. e.g. *Rep.* 422b, 10 εἰ ἐξείη . . . ὑποφύγοντι τὸν πρότερον αἰεὶ προσφερόμενον ἀναστρέφοντα κρούειν. Either the dative or the accusative is allowable, and the shift is simply an accommodation to the nearest construction. The accusative is due to the approach of the infinitive διάγειν. But this is elementary. Wilamowitz proposes ἀντιπαραβάλλειν τε for ἀντιπαραβάλλοντι, making the infinitive depend upon οὐκ ἂν ἀγρὸς εἴη. I hardly think anyone will care for the sentence that results.

CRITO.

52b, 5 ὅτι μὴ ἅπαξ εἰς Ἰσθμόν.

Wilamowitz is quite wrong in saying (p. 343) that these words are found 'only in the margin of some MSS.' They are in the text of T, as he might have seen from my apparatus. He thinks that they are a correction added immediately after the appearance of the dialogue, probably by Plato himself. It is a good deal simpler to suppose that the common original of BW missed a line in the archetype (eighteen letters), which was preserved by T and added in the margin by W. I now regret having placed the words in brackets.

PHAEDO.

Wilamowitz rightly observes that the *Phaedo* was specially liable to corruption and interpolation (p. 342). That was due to its popularity. The Flinders Petrie papyrus, though written within fifty years of Plato's death, has already a remarkable number of corruptions in a very short space. The list of interpolations given by Wilamowitz is too long, however. In 60e, 3 εἰ πολλάκις . . . ποιεῖν is certainly genuine, and so is 72c, 3 καθεύδειν. At 74d, 5, as Wilamowitz might have seen from my second edition, W has καὶ οἷς νῦν δὴ ἐλέγομεν τοῖς ἴσοις, which is unexceptionable.

66c, 2 καὶ τότε, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἡμῖν ἔσται οὐδ' ἐπιθυμοῦμεν τε καὶ φάμεν ἔρασταί εἶναι, φρονήσεως.

Wilamowitz proposes to delete φρονήσεως, and observes that what we desire is καθαρῶς τι εἶδέναι, not φρόνησις, which is attainable even in this life. That is in flat

contradiction. τις τῷ ὄντι αὐτῇ ἀξίω καθαρώς εἶναι thing. I meaning and Iamblichus they did which in

88d,

ὁ Σωκράτης

Wilamowitz

καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν surely a v like ὡς, οὐ λόγος is e in the last incorporat antecedent φάμεν ἡμῖν ὥσπερ οὖν

100d,

ἡ προσγενή

Ever

will be said edition, he he did not is, of course μὲν Ἀφροδίτη Wyttensba

101d,

It is of the world deinom Sta people that what does deduce th According sequences answer him result, then it in the l consequen

In th

the *Politic dialogues* got a colla knowledge

contradiction to the teaching of the ὀρθῶς φιλόσοφοι. Cf. e.g. 68a, 7 φρονήσεως δὲ ἀρα τις τῷ ὄντι ἔρων, καὶ λαβὼν σφόδρα τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην ἐλπίδα, μηδαμοῦ ἄλλοθι ἐντεύξεσθαι αὐτῇ ἀξίως λόγου ἢ ἐν Ἄιδου . . . ib. b, 3 σφόδρα γὰρ αὐτῷ ταῦτα δόξει, μηδαμοῦ ἄλλοθι καθαρῶς ἐντεύξεσθαι φρονήσει ἀλλ' ἢ ἐκεῖ. In Plato, φρόνησις and σοφία are the same thing. To omit φρονήσεως also destroys the argument. Socrates is reinforcing the meaning of φιλόσοφοι by the paraphrase ἐρασταὶ φρονήσεως. The fact that Plutarch and Iamblichus have φρόνησις instead of φρονήσεως only shows that, like Wilamowitz, they did not appreciate the principle of accommodation to the nearest construction, which in this case is that of the relative.

88d, 2 (misprinted 58d and misplaced accordingly) ὥς γὰρ σφόδρα πιθανὸς ὢν, ὃν ὁ Σωκράτης ἔλεγε λόγον, νῦν εἰς ἀπιστίαν καταπέπτωκεν.

Wilamowitz says he cannot see how this can be defended, and rewrites thus: καὶ γὰρ σφόδρα πιθανὸς ὢν ὃν ὁ Σωκράτης ἔλεγε λόγος νῦν εἰς ἀπιστίαν καταπέπτωκεν, surely a very lame sentence indeed. And yet he must know that exclamatory words like ὥς, οἶος, etc., are quite commonly used with participles. His change of λόγον to λόγος is exactly like the change of φρονήσεως to φρόνησις by Plutarch and Iamblichus in the last passage. It is surely elementary that a relative clause with the antecedent incorporated may stand as the subject of a verb, in whatever case the relative and its antecedent may be. Cf. *Rep.* 402b, 9 οὐδὲ μουσικοὶ πρότερον ἐσόμεθα, οὔτε αὐτοὶ οὔτε οὓς φάμεν ἡμῖν παιδευτέον εἶναι τοὺς φύλακας. *Prot.* 342b, 2 ἵνα μὴ κατάδηλοι ᾖσιν . . . ὥσπερ οὓς Πρωταγόρας ἔλεγε τοὺς σοφιστάς.

100d, 5 ἡ ἐκείνου τοῦ καλοῦ εἴτε παρουσία εἴτε κοινωνία εἴτε ὅπη δὴ καὶ ὅπως †προσγενομένη.

Everyone agrees that there is something wrong with *προσγενομένη*, though few will be satisfied with Wilamowitz's *προσγένειτο* ἄν. If he had looked at my second edition, he would have seen that Wytttenbach suggested something far better (though he did not print it in his text), viz. εἴτε ὅπη δὴ καὶ ὅπως *προσγενομένη*. The allusion is, of course, to the formula of religious εὐλάβεια which we find in *Phileb.* 12c, 3 τὴν μὲν Ἀφροδίτην, ὅπη ἐκείνη φίλον, ταύτην προσαγορεύω, and the other passages quoted in Wytttenbach's note.

101d, 3 εἰ δέ τις αὐτῆς τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἔχοιτο.

It is satisfactory that Wilamowitz regards the text as sound, but his rendering of the words quoted is extraordinary. He says: *Das heisst: stellt sich jemand auf deinem Standpunkt (nichts anderes kann heissen)*. It will be news to most people that ἔχομαι τῆς ὑποθέσεως can mean, 'I place myself at a standpoint.' And what does αὐτῆς mean? The point is simply this. The method of Socrates is to deduce the *συμβαίνοντα* of the *ὑπόθεσις* to see whether they confirm it or not. Accordingly, if someone *sticks to the bare hypothesis* and refuses to consider its consequences until you have deduced it from some higher hypothesis, you will refuse to answer him, but will go on with your deduction. If this does not yield a satisfactory result, then, and not till then, will you attempt to justify the hypothesis by regarding it in the light of some higher hypothesis, of which it in turn can be shown to be a consequence.

TETRALOGY II.

In this tetralogy the MS. evidence is less complete. Schanz never edited the *Politicus*, and I collated B for it myself. The readings of T in the same dialogue were published for the first time by me from my photograph. Apelt got a collation of W in the *Sophist* from Vienna, and we have a fairly complete knowledge of it in the *Theaetetus* from Hensel (*Vindiciae Platonicae*, Berlin, 1906),

who also gives some information about it for the *Politicus*. For the *Cratylus* I have now obtained a photograph from Vienna.

CRATYLVS.

385a, 1 ἵσως μέντοι τὶ λέγεις, σκεψώμεθα δέ.

I do not know why Wilamowitz writes μέν for μέντοι. The asseverative μέντοι seems particularly appropriate here.

390a, 1 εἴαντε ἐν ἄλλῃ σιδήρῳ.

Wilamowitz writes εἴαν καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ σιδήρῳ, which of course gives a good sense. Heindorf explained the text as it stands by saying that the words ὁμοίως ὁρθῶς ἔχει τὸ ὄργανον, which ought logically to come after ποιῇ, are anticipated, thus making the three phrases with εἴαντε co-ordinate. Schanz brackets the words. I now think it more likely that εἴαντε ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ (15 letters) formed one line in the archetype, and has been dropped.

393c, 1 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἂν ἦ τοῦ γένους ἕκγονον τὴν φύσιν, τοῦτο λέγω.

I have indicated in my critical note that, with Peipers, I regard ἀλλ' ὁ δ' ἂν in c, 4 (ἀλλ' ὁ δ' ἂν BW : ἄλλο δ' ἂν T) as a variant of ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἂν in c, 1. Wilamowitz agrees, but he prefers to read ἀλλ' ὁ δ' ἂν in c, 1, as Bekker did. That is possible, but I prefer the other variant and render 'a natural offspring of whatever kind it belongs to.'

393d, 3 ἕως δὲ ἐγκρατὴς ἦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πράγματος δηλουμένη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι.

Wilamowitz approves Dümmler's 'brilliant emendation,' ἐναργὴς for ἐγκρατὴς. To me it seems wrong. Socrates is saying that it makes no difference whether a letter is added or subtracted, 'so long as the expression of the essence (of the thing) prevails in the name.' Of course δηλουμένη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι is an adjunct of the predicate ἐγκρατὴς ἦ. It seems to me that we must have a word which means that 'the expression of the essence' still *maintains itself* in spite of the addition or subtraction of letters, and that ἐναργὴς is quite inappropriate.

395e, 1 I think Wilamowitz is right in reverting to the πανταλεία of the best MSS.

418d, 8 I agree that Plato probably wrote διγόν and not δυογόν.

438a, 1 sqq. The passage which I followed Schanz in relegating to the critical notes is certainly genuine, as Wilamowitz thinks, and should be restored to the text. It is not suprising that it should be in Pal.-Vat. 173 (P); for that is very closely related to W, and the passage is in W.

THEAETETVS.

171c, 10 εἰκός γε ἄρα κτλ.

Wilamowitz may be right in preferring the γὰρ of W to the γε ἄρα of B (γ' ἄρ' T). It is perfectly true that the Greeks of Plato's time had no means of distinguishing γ' ἄρ' from γὰρ in writing, but that does not dispense us from the obligation of distinguishing them in the conventional script. Of course, such a distinction is always an interpretation. Wilamowitz ought not, however, to say that the Greeks could not distinguish εἰκός γὰρ and εἰκός γ' ἄρ' by ear, since γ' ἄρ' is enclitic and γὰρ is not. We shall see in other cases that he objects systematically to interpretations which depend on separation of words, elision, and marks of punctuation. That is absurd. Given the conventional script, it is just as much an interpretation to omit these as to print them, and we are bound to use our judgement in every case.

175c

Wila
to the tr
commend
vol. i. 523
mouth of
viel! Thi
Taygetos.
or referri
did not w

224b,

Wila
one city
Polit. 289e
ἄλλων τε
means 'fr
from ἐκ.
This is ma
(224a, 1).
γελοῖον, bu
kept, I pre

240b,

In my
above with
We have
οὐκ = ποινῇ.
means sim
not really
Howe
ὄντως ἐστίν
second! I
sentence, ὁ
dicate as i
ad loc.). H
ὄντως ὄντως
bares! H
μάλα ἀποπο
speaking of
strangeness

241b, 4

Wila
the reading
ῶρα is 'a
a matter of
whom I tal

175c, 4 *κεκτημένος τ' αὐ χρυσίον.*

Wilamowitz (p. 328, n. 3) finds it inconceivable that I should have shut my eyes to the truth—viz., Madvig's conjecture *ταῦ χρυσίον*. On the other hand, Bywater commended me for not mentioning it, when he read my text in proof. From vol. i. 523, n. 1, we learn that *ταῦ* is a 'pre-Hellenic' word which Plato took from the mouth of the people to produce a coarse effect. It is therefore translated *höllich* viel! This 'pre-Hellenic' word is said to have survived chiefly in place-names—e.g. Taygetos. I do not know what Plato wrote in this passage; for he is clearly quoting or referring to something we do not know. I feel perfectly sure, however, that he did not write *ταῦ χρυσίον*.

SOPHIST.

224b, 1 *τὸν μαθήματα συνωνόμενον πόλιν τε ἐκ πόλεως νομισματος ἀμείβοντα κτλ.*

Wilamowitz takes *πόλιν* to be the object of *ἀμείβοντα* and renders 'exchanging one city for another for money.' Compare, however, the parallel passage in *Polit.* 289e, οἱ δὲ πόλιν ἐκ πόλεως ἀλλάττοντες, where the object of *ἀλλάττοντες* is τὰ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν ἔργα, just as here it is *μαθήματα*. In both places *πόλιν ἐκ πόλεως* clearly means 'from city to city.' It is not difficult to supply an *εἰς* to govern the accusative from *ἐκ*. A much stronger case is *γῆν πρὸ γῆς*, which Campbell already compared. This is made practically certain by the full phrase *ἐκ πόλεως . . . εἰς πόλιν* just above (224a, 1). In 224b, 5 Wilamowitz may be right in defending the MS. reading *γελοῖον*, but the construction he suggests is harsh and unnatural; and, if *γελοῖον* is kept, I prefer Campbell's explanation.

240b, 7 *Οὐκ ὄντως οὐκ ὃν ἄρα λέγεις τὸ εἰκός, εἴπερ αὐτό γε μὴ ἀληθινὸν ἐρεῖς;*

'Ἀλλ' ἐστὶ γε μὴν πῶς.

Οὐκοῦν ἀληθῶς γε, φῆς.

Οὐ γὰρ οὖν· πλὴν γ' εἰκὼν ὄντως:

Οὐκοῦν ἄρα οὐκ ὄντως ἐστὶν ὄντως ἢν λέγομεν εἰκόνα;

In my text I followed Badham, as Wilamowitz does, but I should now write as above with C. Ritter (*Neue Forschungen*, p. 14), who has shown that the text is sound. We have only to observe that the first sentence is a question, and that the first *οὐκ* = *nonne*. 'Don't you say that a likeness is really *οὐκ ὃν*?' The last sentence means simply 'Then does it not follow that what we speak of as really an image is not really real?'

However that may be, Wilamowitz spoils the last sentence by reading *οὐκ ὄντως ὄντως ἐστίν*, apparently on the schoolboy ground that the enclitic *ἐστίν* must stand second! He has failed to see that *ὄντως ἢν λέγομεν εἰκόνα* is the subject of the sentence, *ὄντως* being displaced for emphasis and *ἢν* assimilated in gender to the predicate as in *Meno* 81e, 4 ἢν καλοῦμεν μάθησιν ἀνάμνησίς ἐστι (quoted by Heindorf *ad loc.*). He also quite gratuitously adds *ὄντως*, so producing the sentence *οὐκ ὃν ἄρα ὄντως ὄντως ἐστὶν ὄντως ἢν λέγομεν εἰκόνα*, which, as he observes, is 'etwas sonderbares!' He consoles himself by remarking that Theaetetus at once calls it *συμπλοκὴν μάλα ἄτοπον* and that the Eleatic stranger says *Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον*; but they are speaking of the discovery that what is really an image is not really real, not of any strangeness in the sentence.

241b, 4 *ἀλλ' ὅρα δὴ [βουλευέσθαι] τι χρὴ δρᾶν τοῦ σοφιστοῦ πέρι.*

Wilamowitz says (p. 351, n. 2) that I have corrupted this sentence by giving up the reading *ὅρα* and deleting *βουλευέσθαι* (BW) or *βουλεύσασθαι* (T). He admits that *ὅρα* is 'a reading which perhaps arose only from a Byzantine conjecture.' As a matter of fact, it seems to be due to the very ingenious corrector of Coislinianus Γ, whom I take to have been a scholar of the Renaissance. Wilamowitz says that

βουλεύεσθαι can only have arisen from ὥρα. I supposed it to be an ancient variant of δρᾶν which had made its way into the text from the margin. Such things happen in the Platonic text, as Wilamowitz is well aware, but I do not think it would be easy to parallel such a corruption as that of ὥρα to ὅρα from our best MSS.

241c, 2 Ἀδύνατόν γ' ἄν, ὥς ἔοικεν, εἴη τὸν σοφιστὴν ἐλεῖν, εἰ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει.

Wilamowitz reads ἀδύνατον ἄρ', ὥς ἔοικεν with W, and regards εἴη as an interpolation. That is possible, no doubt, but there is some confusion in his argument from *Symp.* 204b, 2 ὃν ἄν (εἴη add. Oxy) καὶ ὁ Ἔρως. If εἴη is an interpolation there, it would only show that the interpolator thought ἄν required a verb, not that he thought εἴη could stand without ἄν. An interpolator would surely have said ἐστίν, not εἴη, if there was no ἄν in his text. If we adopt ἄρα, it would be better to read ὥς ἔοικ', ἄν εἴη with Campbell.

248d, 10 Μανθάνω· τὸ δέ γε (so I should have written with T), ὥς κτλ.

I cannot believe that Μανθάνω here is anything else but the idiomatic 'I see.' To make it govern τόδε γε with Wilamowitz is surely out of the question. The reading τὸ δέ γε (sc. λέγοιεν ἄν) is not adopted by Campbell, though he justifies it abundantly by *Laus* 676b Φέρε, ἀφ' οὗ πόλεις τ' εἰσὶν . . . δοκεῖς ἄν ποτε κατανοῆσαι χρόνον πλήθος ὅσον γέγονεν;—Οὐκ οὖν ῥάδιόν γε οὐδαμῶς.—Τὸ δέ γε (sc. κατανοήσας ἄν), ὥς ἄπλετόν τε καὶ ἀμήχανον ἄν εἴη. The sentence then proceeds quite regularly. 'On that view (κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον)'—viz., that if knowing is action, being known is being acted upon—it follows (δὴ) that, etc.'

249d, 9 I do not know what Plato wrote here, but it is certainly not sufficient to omit μέντ' ἄν with Wilamowitz. We want something which implies a contradiction of Πάνν μὲν οὖν.

POLITICS.

311c, 7 Wilamowitz follows Stallbaum and Hermann in giving the last words to ΣΩ., not to ΝΕ. ΣΩ. He must be aware that the interlocutors of a dialogue were not indicated in any way (any more than the marks of elision, punctuation, etc., to which he so much objects). Generally, it is plain enough from the context who the speaker is. We have only to ask whether there is anything in the context here to indicate a change of speaker, and whether Plato would have been likely to bring the elder Socrates into the dialogue once more without giving us any indication of it. I think not. Moreover, as Campbell said, 'it is not likely that he would interpose without giving young Socrates time to assent to the last proposition.'

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

JOHN BURNET.

PLATO

THE
religion s
may also

The
phatos,²
it as fol
Aphrodite
him a ma
love of al
in other

it origina
folklore, a
may supp
to which
against he
Aphrodite
she deman
Only a di
many deit
scene, in
her beloved
sacrifices b
once kept

The t
corrupt in
emendation
and often d
tators have
from a lack
everywhere
'omne obs
passage, an
point and
recognize t

¹ Var. Hist.

PLATO COMICVS: FRAG. PHAON II.: A PARODY OF ATTIC RITUAL.

THERE is no fragment of the older Attic Comedy that concerns Greek religion so intimately as this, and none which has been so misinterpreted. It may also claim to have a certain value for our literary judgment of Plato.

The story of Phaon is preserved for us by three authorities, Aelian,¹ Palaiaphatos,² and Servius;³ and with few variations and additions all three present it as follows: Phaon was an elderly Lesbian ferryman who transported Aphrodite, disguised as an old woman, across the sea; and she in reward gave him a magic ointment which restored his youth and ensured him the desperate love of all women. I am not concerned here with the handling of the story in other literature, nor with its original significance. We may suspect that it originated as a *ἱερὸς λόγος*. But it is presented to us merely as a piece of folklore, as a theme well suited to the temper of the Middle Attic Comedy. We may suppose that Plato followed a version known to Kratinos,⁴ according to which Aphrodite was the chief lover of Phaon and jealous of guarding him against her rivals. For it is certain, as Meineke has pointed out, that it is Aphrodite who delivers the speech contained in this fragment; in line seven she demands a preliminary sacrifice to herself, under the name *κουροτρόφος*. Only a divinity can demand sacrifice, and *κουροτρόφος* is a familiar epithet of many deities including Aphrodite, and she is the only deity possible in this scene, in which she is trying to keep off the ardent crowd of women from her beloved Phaon, by insisting on long and complicated preliminary rites and sacrifices before their admission to her shrine, where she is keeping him, as she once kept Kinyras.

The text is on the whole well preserved by Athenaeus and only seriously corrupt in line 16. Meineke's comments are occasionally helpful, but his emendations and those he records of older scholars are generally unnecessary and often disastrous: Koch's notes are uncritical and useless. The commentators have suffered from a lack of knowledge of the technique of Greek ritual, from a lack of humour and from a morbid passion for discovering obscenity everywhere: they might have taken as the principle of their textual criticism 'omne obscurum pro obsceno.' They have entirely missed the humour of the passage, and often by pseudo-rational explanation or emendation destroy the point and quaintness of the phrases, chiefly because they have failed to recognize that Aphrodite is speaking as one drunk, and mixes up the termin-

¹ *Var. Hist.* 12, 18.

² *De Incred.* 49.

³ *Ad Verg. Aen.* 3, 279.

⁴ *Athen.*, p. 69.

ology and technical rules of ritual with a drunkard's recklessness. By taking the passage seriously, the commentators have made it utterly insipid. Only by realizing that it is a drunken parody we may possibly find some amusement in it. But to enjoy a parody one must know the original. It is not only the queer recklessness of her ritualistic demands that proves Aphrodite to be drunk, but the words of Athenaeus which preface this quotation prove it also: he gives it as an illustration of the remarkable behaviour of women under the influence of drink.

And Aphrodite's opening words are surely those of the wine-bibber, although their real significance has been doubted: 'How I have been praying for a long time that your folly might become wine.' The only suggestion, as far as I can find, made by the commentators is that *ὄνον* is put by 'surprise' for *ὕδωρ*, as if in the back of her mind was a phrase like the curse of Menelaos in the *Iliad*: 'May you all become earth and water,' which insinuates 'may you all pass away and come to nought'; but that phrase does not seem to have survived down to the later periods of literature, and would hardly help us here if it had.

I can only see in these opening lines a devout prayer that there might be as much wine at hand as they had of foolishness. 'For in your case the proverb comes true, "the hucksterer has not got an ounce of wit in him."' The tradition of the text may be correct; and yet nothing preserved by the *Paroemiographi Graeci* throws any light on this curious expression. It is possible that *καπήλω* is a drunken mistake for some more pointed word resembling it; but no one has yet suggested a possible word in its place that would make a better proverb.

In line 5 *προτέλεια* gains in force if we give it its special sense of offerings preliminary to a marriage.

To understand the point and humour of lines 8-10, one must bear in mind the two types of Greek sacrifice, the animal and the cereal or vegetable (including cakes and fruits), and that some special qualities are sometimes demanded of the animal victim and certain special forms sometimes prescribed for the cereal; thus, pregnant animals might be required in sacrifice to Demeter and the earth-goddess, the male entire animal, *ἐνόρχης*, for Poseidon or Zeus or Ares; again the cakes consecrated to Artemis or Hecate might have to be set round with torches, or stamped with a crescent moon, and many such moulds for stamping cakes have come down to us. Here, then, the drunken joke consists in mixing up the two sets of epithets, those appropriate to animals and those appropriate to cereals, so that we get a *πλακοῦς ἐνόρχης*, as we might say 'a bun entire,' and 'a pregnant cake,' *ἄμυλος ἐγκύμων*.

The next clause in this solemn ritual, the sixteen thrushes—*ὀλόκληροι μέλιτι μεμυγμένοι*—aims at the same sort of humorous effect. 'Ολόκληροι is a sufficiently ludicrous epithet of thrushes. It has properly a legal social significance, referring to a full citizen who is the independent owner of a lot

¹ Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ 594, 598.

of land;
the word
ὕγις κα
It is prop
thrushes,
been joco
and accep
gods or m
item—' tw
this; as th
humorous
invents th

Επισέ
cakes, but
in the shap
the practic
be a suitab
therefore i
speech—as

She th
(emended)
recognize l
to certain
onions, a li
the aphrodi
note the ca
solemn ritu

To Ko
which can b
the *πινακίσ*
up as dedica
with the pur
to purge the

Line 16
fragment, an
short by the
increased by
first word is
of the chang
from their p
humorous, b
This was al
that there is
prescribed i

of land; but we have no clear example of it in this original sense. We find the word in ritual inscriptions: the priest, whether man or woman, must be *ὕγις καὶ ὁλόκληρος*—that is, must be thoroughly sound in all parts of the body. It is properly a human term and not so naturally applied to animals—'sixteen thrushes, good sound birds, mixed up with honey.' Again the epithet has been jocosely transferred from the cereal offerings: honey cakes were a common and acceptable sacrifice; a honeyed thrush was probably unknown hitherto to gods or men. The same point of humour may be discerned in the next curious item—'twelve hares, *ἐπισέληνα*.' None of the commentators find any sense in this; as they have taken every part of the passage *en grand sérieux*, the logic of humorous nonsense offered them no clue. Meineke, anxious for obscene effects, invents the unknown but potentially indecorous word *ἐπισέλινα*.

Επισέληνα is a good word, and Hesychios was right in connecting it with cakes, but wrong in paraphrasing it as *μηννοείδη*, as if the whole cake were made in the shape of the moon. The preposition *ἐπί* shows that the word refers to the practice of stamping the cake with the shape of the moon, so that it might be a suitable offering to Hekate or Selene. No animal was ever so treated, therefore it appeals to Plato, and I think to us, as a good phrase for drunken speech—as 'a hot cross hare' instead of 'a hot cross bun.'

She then proceeds to enumerate simpler and cheaper sacrifices [l. 11 (emended) *ἤδη τὰδ' εὐτελέστατ' ἔστ' ἄκουε δῆ*], and in lines 12-15 we may recognize less humour and more grossness. Certain offerings are prescribed to certain daimones, whose names allude to procreation: three gallons of onions, a liberal allowance, to Orthannes (in the other long fragment of *Phaon* the aphrodisiac quality of onions is emphasized also by Athenaeus, p. 63). We note the careful prescription of measure, which is quite in the style of the solemn ritual inscriptions.

To Konisalos and the Twin Helpers an obscene offering is demanded, which can be interpreted by the help of Aristophanes. We need only note that the *πινακίσκος* might have been suggested by the *πίνακες* that were often hung up as dedications in temples, and that the idea expressed in line 15 is consonant with the purificatory use of torches in Greek ritual, their original intention being to purge the air of daimonic influence.

Line 16 is at once the crux and the most interesting passage of the whole fragment, and was the starting-point of the present paper. We are pulled up short by the astonishing phrase *κυσί τε καὶ κυνηγέταις*; and our difficulty is increased by the corruption of the first words of the line *πύργης τετάρτης*. The first word is meaningless, and some commentators would change both—most of the changes proposed being in the direction of obscenity. It is obvious from their position that the words denote some kind of sacrifice, perhaps humorous, but probably derived from the actual terminology of Greek ritual. This was almost entirely innocent of obscene vocabulary, and we should note that there is no obscenity of actual phrase in any of the terms of sacrifice prescribed in this fragment, for even the *μύρτων πινακίσκος* is only latently

obscene, as the word *μύρτων* primarily bore the meaning of myrtle boughs which could be of ritualistic use.¹ Only, the spirit of drunken parody prevails throughout. We should seek then in the terminology of Greek ritual inscriptions, unknown to Meineke and unused by Koch, for our emendation. An inscription from Dittenberger's *Sylloge*,² No. 618, may help us, which prescribes as a state-offering *σπυρῶν τρεῖς τεταρτῆς*, three-quarter loaves or cakes of wheaten meal, and Hesychios gives us *σπυρούς* as an equivalent for *πυρούς*. One might suggest then for our corrupt passage *σπυρῶν τεταρτῆς* (from *τεταρτεῖς*) quarters of wheaten cake; the rare and technical word *σπυρῶν* might account for the bungling of the later copyist; and such an offering to dogs would sound quaint enough, and certainly conform to the rule of cheapness, as also do the offerings of a drachma and three obols to other Priapean demons. Money-offerings though rare were not unknown in Greek ritual.³

Finally the drunken parody of reality is maintained to the end: for the hero Keles is to get the skin of the victim and *θυλήματα*, a vague word which may mean sacrificial cakes and which Aristophanes in his description of the sacrifice in the *Peace* associates with the *σπλάγχνα*. The only joke here is in the *δέρμα*, for she forgets that a victim must be offered before there is a skin, and that the skin was never offered but was reserved as a perquisite for the priest or for the state.

So in respect of the sacrifices all is topsy-turvy, in the style of Gilbert and Sullivan. We can now return to the Daimones, leaving aside for a moment the *κύνες* and the *κυνηγέται*. The others are a disreputable fraternity that remind us vividly of some of the Roman *Indigitamenta* in Varro's list. They may be called Functional Daimones, or, in Usener's phrase, 'Sonder-Götter' or 'Augenblick-Götter,' of which type the best attested and clearest example was *μυίαγρος*, the Fly-chaser of Arcadia. I have elsewhere discussed the fallacy of Usener's theory in regard to these.³ Greek polytheism, with its strong sense of personal *θεοί*, bearing marked individuality and of varied moral attributes, did not wholly succeed in purging the air of this non-moral daimonistic animism. 'Lordon' and Kubdoso and Keles may be mere figments of Plato's imagination, invented in keeping with the humour of an impure plot: we know nothing about them except their Priapean significance, which their etymology proves. It is otherwise with Konisalos and Orthannes. The former name is mysterious, and we do not know from what language it is derived; but we know that it designated an ithyphallic daimon of Attica rooted in popular belief. He appears in the humorous passage of Aristophanes *Ekklesiazousai*, where the woman-leader asks the approaching Spartan herald, 'Are you a real man or Konisalos?'⁴ and Strabo speaking of Priapos says that in character 'he is like the Attic Orthannes and Konisalos and Tuchon and such personages.'⁵

It may be said for the credit of the state religion that we have found no

¹ They are mentioned among the offerings to Despoina in the inscription found near Lykosoura (Dittenberger, *Syll.* 2 939).

² E.g. Prott-Ziehen, 97, inscription from

Amorgos, money-offering called *πῆλαρος*.

³ Vide *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor*, p. 81.

⁴ L. 982.

⁵ P. 588.

evidence
animism
the disc
century
a priesth
cleruchs
when th
institute
because
Imbram

We
with Kor
designati
religious
and the l

We
from the
of obsce
authors.
dog, and
language
ordinary
ignorance
nothing e
the face,
our intell
few that
and also
to Greek
near Zea
that year
before vis
who set u
to Malea
dogs,' an
daimonia
we must i
were kept
effect his
at least, in
be the h

¹ B.C.H.

² This is
on the inscri
71. The Ed

evidence as yet of any public cult in Attica of these crude products of popular animism. But our appreciation of the higher spirit of Hellenism suffers from the discovery of an inscription showing that the state of Imbros in the third century B.C. gave to Orthannes the title of *Θεός* and consecrated to him a priesthood with a processional and sacrificial service.¹ The men of Imbros were cleruchs of Athens, who may have lapsed into a daimonistic animism at a time when they were suffering from a decay of population; or they may have instituted the cult, as Foucart, who published the inscription, has suggested, because they interpreted the phallic god of the island, the Kabeiric *Hermes Imbramos*, as their Attic daimon Orthannes.

We need not waste time over the nameless *παροστάται δόουν*—coupled with Konisalos, doubtless with Priapean significance—except to note that their designation works into the humour of the whole, which is a parody of real religious things; for the epithet *παροστάτης* was a solemn title both of Herakles and the Dioskouroi as 'helpful comrades.'

We must now grapple with 'the dogs and the dog-leaders.' All we get from the old commentators is wanton emendation and unnecessary suggestions of obscenity. It is no use hunting for figurative uses of 'dog' in Greek authors. In certain passages and at certain times, a harlot might be called a dog, and so might a Bacche or a Fury or Klytemnestra. But sacrificial language is not poetical, and sacrifices were not offered—even in a parody—to ordinary mortals. There is something honest in Meineke's confession of ignorance, 'credo aliud quid latere;' for when he wrote there was really nothing else to say. But since 1885 the 'aliud quid' has been staring us in the face, and the light that it throws on this passage would have penetrated our intelligence long ago, only that the fragment of Plato was treated by the few that handled it with too great reverence and without any sense of humour,² and also that our philologists cannot yet be induced to pay due attention to Greek inscriptions and Greek religion. An inscription was found in 1885 near Zea in the Peiraeus, and published in the *Ephemeris Archaeologike*³ of that year, prescribing the preliminary sacrifices that should be performed before visiting the temple of Asklepios in the Peiraeus. The Eleusinian priest who set up the inscription enacts that three cakes shall be offered respectively to Maleatas, Apollo, Hermes, Iaso, Akeso and Panakeia; three cakes 'to the dogs,' and three to the 'dog-leaders' (*κυνηγέταις*). Now we know of no daimoniatic beings who could possibly be called 'dogs' in this context, and we must interpret the words as referring to real sacred dogs such as we know were kept in the temple at Epidauros and were often inspired by the god to effect his cures. These, then, must have been also maintained, for a time at least, in the temple of the Peiraeus. But the *κυνηγέται* could not conceivably be the human and mortal keepers of the dogs; for at no period of Greek

¹ B.C.H. 1883, p. 166.

² This is notably the case in the commentary on the inscription in Prott-Ziehen, *Leges Sacrae*, 71. The Editors honestly try to interpret the

two documents together, but go laboriously astray.

³ 1885, p. 85; also in C.I.A. 1637, and Dittenberger *Sylloge*, 631.

paganism could the human guardians or officials of a temple receive 'a sacrifice.' The 'dog-guardians' must therefore be imagined as heroic beings belonging to the circle of Asklepios, such as Machaon or Podaleirios. A sacrifice to them causes no difficulty. What shocks us is that Athenians of the fourth century should be ordered to pay sacrifice—a definite act of worship—to temple dogs by an Eleusinian priest in a public ritual law.

Now here we have the astonishing coincidence of the collocation of *κυσί* and *κυνηγέταις* in two documents, the one a formal hieratic inscription, the other a fragment of a wild comedy, and nowhere else in the whole of Greek literature; in the former it has a serious and explicable purport, in the latter it appears as unintelligible nonsense. Surely there is an artful connexion to be assumed between the two documents which explains and justifies the nonsense. My theory, then, is that Plato was deliberately parodying the solemn grotesque phrase of the Eleusinian priest, who had perpetrated under Epidaurian influences a piece of religious savagery that shocked the more enlightened Athenians and perhaps had already provoked criticisms. The parody would be eminently topical, eminently in the style of Gilbert and Sullivan; and the parody may well extend beyond this actual phrase that puzzles us most; just as the Eleusinian priest ordains a monotonous list of offerings not only to high and known divinities, but to a number of functional daimones, of whom probably the Athenian public heard now for the first time, Iaso Akeso Panakeia, and reaches his climax with his dogs and dog-wardens, all as part of a *προθυσία*, so the quick-witted comedian in his *ἱερὸς νόμος* rolls out his list of unfamiliar and newly-created functional daimones, and crowns the list with his 'dogs and dog-wardens,' that have no function here except to mock that sacerdotal silliness in the Peiraeus. This theory, of course, assumes that the inscription had already been set up in the Peiraeus, and had attracted much public notice and comment before Plato's comedy was performed; it would also be the better for my view if we could believe that the first event only preceded the second by a short space of time, so that the topical joke would have all the bloom of freshness.

On general grounds Meineke's view will commend itself to those familiar with the history of Attic Comedy, that the *Phaon* belongs to the latest period of Plato's career. It has evidently the characteristics of the Middle Comedy, being a non-political mythologic burlesque without chorus. Though contemporary with Eupolis and Aristophanes, Plato was living and producing comedies at least as late as 390 B.C.¹ Also, if we accept Meineke's most probable emendation of a statement by the Scholiast on Aristophanes *Plut.* 179,² we gain an exact date for the production of the *Phaon*, viz. 391 B.C.

Now the writing of the inscription of the Peiraeus bears evident traces of

¹ The quotation from his play in Plutarch *Præc. republ. ger.*, p. 801 B, proves this—vide Meineke, p. 161.

² *ἐμφαίνει δὲ καὶ Πλάτων· ἐν τῷ Φαίδρῳ* (emend

Φάωνι) ἐπτακαίδεκάτῳ ἔτει ὑστερον διδασθέντι ὡς ἐπὶ Φιλοκλέους ὡς μηκέτι ὁμοῦ αὐτῆς (i.e. Λαίδος). The *Φαῖδρος* is an unlikely title, and there is no mention of it in the list given by Suidas.

the style of
publication
with all the
was strong
Middle.
parody of
sacrifice to
it may be
hear no more

In other
have expressed
contemporary
and disliked
and benefited
that Aristotle
though he
kindly philosophy
cult towards
which in
Asklepios
shafts of A
Adonis.

From
fragment.
tendency
seems also
Φιλοθύτης
of divinity
may be given
powers, especially
content to
Lucian, see
and every
not even
initiation-
(why should
taken his

One line
of Greece,
deceived by
a serious
take any line
gods, with

the style of the first decade of the fourth century; so that the theory that its publication was fairly recent at the time when the *Phaon* was produced agrees with all the facts that are at our command. We know that the love of parody was strong in the older Attic Comedy and was a dominant characteristic of the Middle. We need not then be surprised at this example, unique as it is, of the parody of a *ἱερὸς νόμος*. It was well for the religion that this quaint rule of sacrifice to the dogs and the dog-leaders should not pass unchallenged. And it may be that the humour of the comedian helped to abolish it; at any rate, we hear no more of it from this time onwards.

In other ways, we may surmise, the passage that we are considering may have expressed a serious religious feeling in the poet's mind. He, like his older contemporaries, Aristophanes and Eupolis, may have viewed with suspicion and dislike the introduction of new cults; and the cult of Asklepios, harmless and beneficial as it was, was still at this date an innovation. And we discern that Aristophanes in the *Plutus* treats it with much humour and scant respect, though he does not take any gross liberty with the dignified figure of the kindly physician god. We have another example of the invasion of a strange cult towards the close of the fifth century in the Cypriote Adonis rites, which in the religious emotion they excited were more alien than those of Asklepios to the older Attic temperament; nor did these escape the satyric shafts of Aristophanes, nor of Plato also, as it appears from the fragment of his *Adonis*.

From another point of view we may discover a half-serious motive in our fragment. The comedian may be venting his feelings against the growing tendency at Athens towards the multiplication of sacrifices, a feeling which seems also to have inspired his comedy the *Ἑορταί*, as also the play called *Φιλοθύτης* by his contemporary Metagenes. At the same time the quaint list of divinities that are proclaimed in the ritual law of the *Phaon* suggests that he may be girding at the extravagant devotion of women to obscure daimonistic powers, especially those of procreation, whom sane and economic citizens were content to ignore. A voice from much later literature, from the *Evrotes* of Lucian, seems to re-echo the sentiment we may attribute here to Plato: 'Each and every god is a burden on the married couples, and the wretched men do not even know their very names, the Koliades, the Genetyllides . . . secret initiation—rites and "suspect" mysteries from which men are excluded—and (why should we mince matters?) mere corruption of the soul.' Lucian had taken his jibe at the Koliades and Genetyllides directly from Aristophanes.¹

One last reflection is pertinent here. Aphrodite, one of the great deities of Greece, is here introduced on the stage speaking as one drunk, unless we are deceived by Athenaeus and misled in our interpretation of the parody. This is a serious matter. We do not find any exact parallel in Aristophanes; he could take any liberties with Herakles the genial hero, with Hermes the lackey of the gods, with Dionysos who as the patron-deity of comedy might enjoy being

¹ *Clouds*, 52.

treated *en bon camarade*, but he refrained as far as we know from representing the High Gods in degrading or ridiculous positions. The poets of the Middle Comedy, whose subjects were so often a travesty of the old myths, may have gone further than he in irreverence. The title of Plato's play—the Zeus *κακούμενος*—suggests that the Supreme God himself was by no means sacrosanct. It may be also that some of the travesties of myths found on vases of Magna Graecia, which are the products of a very vulgar sentiment, have been inspired by the Middle Comedy. The license of the Attic stage might then be regarded as one of the causes contributory to the decay of Greek polytheism. On the other hand, a warning is necessary against the over-rapid conclusions of some scholars, who considerably antedate that decay and forget how a popular religion of long tradition can tolerate the wildest irreverence of a carnival. But however we may judge the larger question, we must admit that this fragment of the *Phaon* is unique among the débris of Attic Comedy.

EXETER COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

LEWIS R. FARNELL.

I. 8.

For
'This is
attracted
πρόφασις ἡ

II. 10
ἀν γὰρ ἡμῶν
For
and to give

II. 11
ἐπετείλει
μενα.

Editor
have these
ἐπετείλει in
tenses alre
to correct
infinitive
doing not
What
as μηδέν sl
to do any
thenes, an

II. 3
τῷ χρόνῳ,

The
author is
place a fu
instance i
beauty,' et
is the mos

II. 36
Jacob
ἐν. The

representing
the Middle
may have
the Zeus
crosanct.
f Magna
inspired
regarded
On the
of some
popular
carnival.
that this

RNELL.

NOTES ON ACHILLES TATIVS.

- I. 8. 2. οὐκ ἀκούεις τοῦ Διὸς λέγοντος
τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακόν, ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες
τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμόν, ἔδν κακὸν ἀμφαγαπῶντες;
αὕτη κακῶν ἡδονή.

For κακῶν, Göttling, read γυναικῶν. It is simpler to read αὕτη κακόν, ἡδονή = 'This is "the evil," namely pleasure.' Instead of writing τοῦτο, the author has attracted the subject to the gender of the predicate, a common idiom. Cf. αὕτη ἄλλη πρόφασις ἦν. The construction is vivid and forcible.

II. 19. 1. προσθῶμεν ἥδη τι καὶ ἐρωτικόν. φέρε, ἀνάγκην ἀλλήλοις ἐπιθῶμεν πίστει·
ἂν γὰρ ἡμᾶς Ἀφροδίτῃ μυσταγωγῆσθαι κτλ.

For ἐρωτικόν it is plain that we should read ἐποπτικόν, to lead up to μυσταγωγῆσθαι, and to give point to πίστει = 'let us add something of love's deeper initiation.'

II. 19. 6. ὁ Σάτυρος . . . τὴν ἀνοιξιν πειράται καὶ ὡς εἶρε δυνατόν τὴν Κλειώ τ'
ἐπεπείκει καὶ τῆς κόρης συνειδυίας, μηδὲν ἀντιπράξαι τῇ κόρῃ τέχνῃ, ταῦτα ἦν τὰ συγκεί-
μενα.

Editors remove τ', καὶ before τῆς κόρης, and bracket κόρῃ before τέχνῃ. But how have these words made their appearance at all? It is strange to find a pluperfect ἐπεπείκει in this sentence. We should expect an aorist or a present, as these two tenses already appear. πειράται rather leads us to expect a present tense; it is easy to correct τεπεπείκει to θεραπεύει, retaining καί = 'actually.' θεραπεύει is used with the infinitive in Thucydides. 'He wheedles Cleio, the girl actually being privy, into doing nothing against the trick.' Cleio was a θεράπεινα.

What underlies τῇ κόρῃ τέχνῃ? κόρῃ is clearly the relic of some emphatic word as μηδὲν shows; the true reading may well be μηδὲν ἀντιπράξαι ἀκαρῇ τῇ τέχνῃ = 'not to do anything at all against the device.' ἀκαρῇ is used by Aristophanes, Demosthenes, and Plato; it also occurs in other erotic writers.

II. 36. 1. οὐ γὰρ γεγηρακυῖαν ἔχει τὴν ἡδονὴν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσον ἐλαττοῦται
τῷ χρόνῳ, τοσοῦτον εἰς μέγεθος ἐκτείνεται πόθῳ.

The subject of ἔχει is τὸ ἀρπαζόμενον = 'what is being stolen away from us.' The author is making a general reflection, which really ends at ἡδονήν, where we should place a full stop. He then gives a *particular instance* of the law he lays down: that instance is concealed under the words τοῖς ἄλλοις, and is simply τὸ κάλλος = 'So too beauty,' etc. That this correction is certain is clear from § 2, which says 'The rose is the most beautiful of flowers,' ὅτι τὸ κάλλος φεύγει ταχύ [τοῖς = τὸ κ.].

II. 36. 3. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν οὐράνιον ἀχθεται θνητῷ κάλλει δεδεμένον.

Jacobs proposed σκήνει for κάλλει, but such a word would more naturally require ἐν. The dative looks like an instrumental [cf. V. 18. 4, ἐδέθην σιδήρῳ], i.e. we want

some word = 'bond.' May we not read ἀλύσει? Hdt. 9. 74 has χρυσή ἀλύσι δεδεμένη. The repetition of κάλλος in § 2 would easily account for κάλλει in § 3. If the original were written ἀλύσι, as it might be, the corruption would be almost inevitable.

II. 37. 3. ὁ δὲ ἀνάρπαστος γενόμενος ὑβρίζεται καὶ ἔοικεν τυραννουμένῳ.

Jacobs read ἐσταυρωμένῳ—a vicious perversion. Ganymede carried up to heaven could not possibly have his hands *stretched out*, like those of a crucified man: he would present the appearance of a body limp and helpless; in fact, the author wrote κεραυνουμένῳ = 'smitten by a thunderbolt.' For τ = κ cf. VI. 5. 4 αἰτία of MS. = αἰκία (Salmasius).

II. 38. 2. καὶ ἔστιν αὐτῆς τὸ κάλλος ἢ μύρων ἢ τριχῶν βαφῆς ἢ καὶ φιλημάτων.

καί is here pointless, while φιλημάτων is corrupt. What is the true reading? In § 3 the author says 'the beauty of a boy is not wet with scent or with alien odours, while (§ 4) his body can be seen in the gymnasium.' The balance clearly shows that the true text must refer to *garments*, woman's body being hidden, whereas that of a boy is revealed. We may then emend with certainty to ἢ ποικιλμάτων = 'cunningly wrought clothes.' The preceding chapter talks about φιλήματα *ad nauseam*. Remembering this, the scribe transposed κ and τ, and so produced the MS. reading.

III. 7. 1. θέλει δὲ τὸ ὄρυγμα λέγειν ὅτι μὴ τις αὐτὸ πεποίηκε χεῖρ, ἀλλ' ἔστιν αὐτόχθον ἢ γραφή.

[MS. αὐτόχθων, corr. Hercher.] For ἢ we should simply read ἦ = 'natural, *quâ* picture.' The author is describing a painting.

III. 15. 3. εἶτα κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς σπονδὴν περιχέαντες, περιάγουσι τὸν βωμόν.

Query περιῖξ χέαντες?

III. 21. 3. πάντως δὲ καὶ ὁ χρησμός ἡμῖν ἐς τὸ λαθεῖν χρήσιμος· ὁ σίδηρος γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐσταλμένην διὰ ταύτης ἀνατμηθῆναι μέσην τῆς ἐσθῆτος λέγει ὁ χρησμός.

For ὁ σίδηρος we should read ποδίρει = 'with a garment reaching to her feet.' The word occurs III. 13. 2 ποδίρεις ἀσπίδας.

III. 21. 6. ταῦτα λέγων ἐδεόμην Δία Ξένιον καλῶν καὶ κοινῆς ἀναμνησκῶν τραπέζης καὶ χρηστῆς καὶ κοινῆς ναυαγίας.

χρηστῆς has probably been corrupted by ὁ δὲ χρηστὸς οὗτος, the opening words of the next chapter. The true reading is χρήσεως = 'I besought him, calling on Zeus Xenius, and reminding him of our common table and our intimacy and common shipwreck.' For confusion of ω and η see III. 5. 4 ὤνησεν for ἤνησεν.

III. 24. 3. τοὺς γὰρ βαρβάρους τοὺς κατατρέχοντας πεπαῦσθαι, μελλούσης δὲ ἡκεῖν τῆς δυνάμεως, τὸν ὄριν αὐτοῖς ἐπιδημῆσαι τὸν ἱερὸν, φέροντα τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν ταφὴν· ἀνάγκαι δὲ ἦσαν τὴν ἕξοδον ἐπισχεῖν τοσούτων ἡμερῶν.

Such is the MS. reading: all that is necessary is to put a comma after ταφὴν and read ἀνάγκη δέησαν κτλ., an absolute construction = 'it having been necessary perforce for them to put off their march for so many days.' For δέησαν see L. and S. δει III. 1 fin.

IV. 4. 5. ἂν δέ τι τῶν ἀδρότέρων ἰδῇ, τούτῳ περιβάλλει.

The author clearly wrote λαροτέρων = 'dainty bits.'

IV. 7. ἔμμηνα καὶ

We s

IV. 1

Leuc

IV. 1

ρέων ἀχρ
μεγάλον
τρῆς, δύο
σχίσματα

We s

proceeds
of it.' εἰ
author w
geminus.

had taken
'and mak

IV. 1

I.e. e

IV. 1

I.e. o

IV. 1

I.e. o

true.'

IV. 1

I.e. λ

V. 6.

The

which the
add ἥλιος
quote an

VIII

The

'lily-maid

VIII

κλήσεως κ

Hirs

trial, wo
a pallet.'

VIII

εὐροῦσα π

We

IV. 7. 7. βούλει τὴν ἀληθείαν ἀκοῦσαι τῆς ἀναβολῆς; ἡ γὰρ αὐτὴ χθὲς ἀφῆκε τὰ ἔμμηνα καὶ ἀνδρὶ συνελθεῖν οὐ θέμις.

We should read ἡ γὰρ; αὐτὴ κτλ. = 'do you really?'

IV. 10. 2. χαίρουσι γὰρ οἱ ἐρῶντες εἰς τὰ ἐρωτικὰ πράγματα.

Leucippe was a victim of *μανία*. We may then confidently write *ταράγματα*.

IV. 11. 3. 4. ὁ Νεῖλος ρεῖ μὲν ἄνωθεν ἐκ Θηβῶν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ἐστὶν εἰς τοῦτο ρέων ἄχρι Μέμφεως καὶ ἐστὶ μικρὸν κάτω (Κερκάσωρος ὄνομα τῇ κώμῃ) πρὸς τῷ τέλει τοῦ μεγάλου ρεύματος. (4) ἐντεῦθεν δὲ περιρρήγνυται τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐξ ἐνὸς ποταμοῦ γίνονται τρεῖς, δύο μὲν ἐκατέρωθεν λευμμένοι, ὁ δὲ εἰς ὥσπερ ἦν ρέων πρὶν λυθῆναι καὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς τὰ σχίσματα Δέλτα ποιῶν.

We should read καὶ εἰσιν εἰς ταῦτο ρέων ἄχρι . . . καὶ ἐς τι μικρὸν κάτω = 'And proceeds flowing in one body as far as Memphis and to a certain point slightly north of it.' εἰς τὰ σχίσματα cannot mean 'within the branches': is it not likely that the author would remind the readers of the epithet *ἐπτάρρους*? Cf. Virgil's *septem-geminus*. εἰστα could quite naturally be a misreading for *ἐπτα*: when this corruption had taken place, *σχίσμασι* would be accommodated to it. We can then translate 'and making the land the Delta by means of its seven cuttings.'

IV. 14. 2. ἀνέψαν ὀλίγον τοῦ χώματος εἰς ὃ σαλεύεται.

I.e. εἰς ὅσα δεύεται = 'until the plain is thoroughly soaked.'

IV. 14. 6. τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὴν λίμνην ὕδωρ παντὸς ὑπὲρ κεφαλὴν ἀνδρὸς ἦν.

I.e. *στάντος* = 'over the head of a man standing up.'

IV. 17. 1. Ὡ γῆς τέκνον, ὦ φάρμακον . . . ἀληθεύσειαν σοῦ τὰ ἐπαγγέλματα.

I.e. ἀληθεύσαι *ἀν*, a mild imperative = 'Let, I pray thee, thy promise come true.'

IV. 19. 4. ἐστὶ δὲ τοῦ λοῖπου βλοσυρώτερος τὰ ὄμματα.

I.e. *λύκον*.

V. 6. 3. ἐς δὲ τὴν τοῦ ὄρους ἀκρόπολιν ὁ τῶν νεῶν κυβερνήτης ἀνέτελλεν ἄλλος.

The author is describing the Pharos of Alexandria. On the top of the rock on which the lighthouse was built was the guide of the ship. What is ἄλλος? Editors add ἡλῖος—'a second sun'! The reading is simply *δαλός*, a beacon-light. L. and S. quote an instance from the *Anthology*, 9. 675.

VIII. 6. 7. ἀλλὰ παρθένος εὐειδὴς οἷαν εἶχεν κρίνειν.

The author wrote οἷα λευκὸν κρίνον = 'as white as a lily.' *Syrinx* was the 'lily-maid.'

VIII. 7. 1. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐτοίμη εἰς τὸ τῆς σύριγγος σπήλαιον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ χωρὶς κλήσεως κατακεκλεισθαι.

Hirschig read *προκλήσεως*. But *Leucippe*, as a *δούλη* pending the result of the trial, would have no such right. We should therefore read *κλίσεως* = 'without a pallet.' She is willing to suffer even privation to assert her virginity.

VIII. 10. 9. καιρὸν τοῦτον νενόμικεν εὐκαιρον μοιχείας κατ' αὔχημα καὶ νεανίσκον εὐρόντα πόρνον κτλ.

We should read κατ' οἶκημα = 'in a house of shame.'

T. W. LUMB.

(To be continued.)

THE UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT OF APVLEIVS' METAMORPHOSES (LAURENTIAN. 68.2) AND ITS OLDEST TRANSCRIPT (LAURENTIAN. 29.2).

THE chief works of Tacitus and Apuleius have come down to us in a single Beneventan—i.e. South Italian—MS. of the eleventh century. The *Annals* (books XI.-XVI.) and *Histories* (books I.-V.) of Tacitus, and the *Apologia*, *Metamorphoses*, and *Florida* of Apuleius, depend solely on the authority of the famous Florentine MS. preserved in the Laurentian Library under the press-mark 68.2. Any new light that can be thrown on such a MS. is of interest to classical scholars. With the portion of the MS. containing the works of Tacitus the writer has dealt at some length in a paper read in April, 1913, in London before the International Congress of Historical Studies, which paper will be published shortly. Here it is proposed to deal with the portion containing the works of Apuleius, and with the oldest extant transcript of this portion, which is also in Beneventan writing, and is likewise preserved in the Laurentian Library under the press-mark 29.2. In the critical apparatus of Apuleius Laur. 68.2 is cited as *F*, and Laur. 29.2 as *φ*.

THE TWO PARTS OF LAUR. 68.2.

Before proceeding to the main subject a few words should be said on the relations of the two portions of Laur. 68.2.

The MS. is composed of two distinct parts: folios 1-103 contain Tacitus; folios 104-191 contain Apuleius. The two parts did not form one volume originally, and C. Paoli had observed that in an earlier binding the works of Apuleius preceded those of Tacitus.¹ We do not know when the works of Tacitus and Apuleius were first joined under one cover. When Professor H. E. Butler says in his preface to the Oxford edition of the *Apologia*² that 'the only mention of the works of Tacitus at Monte Cassino suggests that they were bound up with the poems of Homer' he is giving currency to an erroneous and discarded interpretation of an item in a catalogue in the *Chronicle of Monte Cassino*.³ Professor Butler further says that the hands of the Tacitus and Apuleius portions are identical. Professor Rostagno in his *Praefatio* (p. xvi) expresses himself more cautiously, and says that they are very much

¹ Cf. Rostagno, *Praefatio*, p. 11, in the facsimile edition of Tacitus (68.2) in *Codd. Graeci et Latini photographice depicti*, Vol. VII., pars 2 (Leyden, 1902).

² H. E. Butler and A. S. Owen, *Apulei Apo-*

logia, pp. xxxi sq. (Oxford, 1914).

³ See F. Haase's edition of Tacitus i., p. lxix., and M. Manitius, *Philologisches aus alten Bibliothekscatalogen*, p. 68, in *Rheinisches Museum*, 47 (1892), *Ergänzungsheft*.

UNIQ

alike. T
points of
Apuleius

T us
hand, us

indicate
invariabl
descends
character

that the
ence betw

assibilat
8-shaped

less mar
identical

another
general

developm
go to sh

reasonab
between

Eve

Metamor
page in

derived
since be

Apologia
shows t

inductu
Of all

Laur. 29
exempla

readings
not in s

other re
above is

¹ Facsim
edition of
have a co
Leyden se
page in hi

² This i
the pro-sy

alike. That the two hands are not identical may be seen from the following points of difference (let *T* represent the scribe of Tacitus and *F* the scribe of Apuleius):¹

T used ; as the punctuation at the end of a paragraph; *F*, on the other hand, uses the simple point (.). *T* frequently uses two horizontal lines to indicate abbreviation (\bar{c} =con, \bar{e} =est, \bar{n} =non, \bar{u} =uer, etc.); whereas *F* invariably uses the single horizontal stroke. Final *r* is short in *T*; in *F* it descends below the line. In *T* the down-stroke of *p* has a curious and characteristic inclination to the left in the familiar *pro*-symbol (ρ), so much so that the symbol somewhat resembles the letter π ; in *F* this pronounced difference between ordinary *p* and the *p* in the *pro*-symbol does not exist. The form of assimilated *ti* (as in *spatia*) is different in *T* and *F*. In *F* the upper loop of this 8-shaped ligature is considerably to the right of the lower loop. This is much less marked in *T*. These differences are enough to prove that *T* and *F* are not identical: that in MS. Laur. 68.2 one scribe wrote the Tacitus and quite another scribe the Apuleius. There is moreover a marked difference in the general impression made by *T* and *F*. The latter represents a further stage of development. If the Tacitus was copied, as script and historical considerations go to show, about the middle of the eleventh century, the Apuleius may reasonably be ascribed to the end of that century. So much for the relation between the Tacitus and Apuleius portions of MS. Laur. 68.2.

ON THE MSS. OF APVLEIVS.

Ever since H. Keil made the discovery that all the MSS. of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* suffer from a lacuna in book VIII., caused by a partially torn page in Laur. 68.2, it has been universally recognized that all MSS. are derived from the single source, Laur. 68.2.³ Corroborative evidence has since been adduced by R. Helm, who showed that in a certain passage in the *Apologia*, where, owing to extreme thinness of parchment in *F*, a letter *u* shows through between the words *inducat* and *animum*, some MSS. have *inducatu animum*, and others, resorting to conjecture, give *inducat in animum*.⁴ Of all the transcripts of *F* only one is of importance, and that is ϕ , or Laur. 29.3. It is important to us for two reasons: It was written before its exemplar, *F*, was as badly defaced as it is now, so that for a number of readings we depend entirely on ϕ , since *F* has become illegible. Whether or not in such cases ϕ is to be trusted implicitly we shall see presently. The other reason is that ϕ is the oldest MS. in which the lacuna in *F* referred to above is supplied. This supplement could be derived from a MS. of Apuleius

¹ Facsimiles of *F* will be found in R. Helm's edition of the *Florida* (Leipzig, 1910). Of *T* we have a complete facsimile reproduction in the Leyden series, and E. Chatelain reproduces a page in his *Paléographie des classiques latins*, p. 146.

² This is very striking where ordinary *p* and the *pro*-symbol come together. Cf. col. 2, lines

2 and 3 of folio 38, the page reproduced by Chatelain.

³ H. Keil, *Observationes in Catonis et Varronis de re rustica libros* (Halle, 1849), pp. 77 sq.

⁴ See his preface (pp. xxix sq.) to the Teubner edition of the *Florida*.

now lost, or from the portion torn out of *F*, which had been recovered, or it may be the result of clever conjecturing. That the last is the most likely is the conclusion reached by the writer after a careful examination of *F* (foll. 160^r and 160^v) and ϕ (foll. 53^r and 53^v).

No one who has compared a page of text in ϕ with the same text in *F* will for a moment maintain that ϕ is a painfully accurate copy of its exemplar. A careful comparison of the text on the torn folio (160^r and 160^v) in *F* with the corresponding folio (53^r and 53^v) in ϕ has convinced me that the scribe of ϕ differed from the average scribe in that he tried to make sense of what he was copying, and that when his exemplar seemed faulty or dubious or had what seemed to him archaic spelling he did not hesitate to change or emend. He did not copy word for word, but carried entire phrases or clauses in his mind, with the result that he made gratuitous modifications and transpositions. Nor did he try his utmost to decipher all that was possible. For when he came to the faded writing at the foot of fol. 159^v in *F* (*Metam.* VIII. 6, ed. Helm, 180, 23-24) he left blank spaces for the words that were difficult to read. He wrote (top of fol. 53^r):

ipse fecerat auide circumplexus, omnia quidem lu-
gentium officia ————— affinxit sed sole la-
crime procedere noluerunt. Sic —————
————— lamentabamur, etc.

A much later hand (the hand that supplied the other lacuna) inserted *sollerter* after *officia*. Even to-day, after a lapse of seven centuries, when the original from which ϕ copied is certainly less and not more legible than it was in the thirteenth century, when ϕ was written, we can still discern *s.l.rter*. Yet the scribe of ϕ apparently made no effort to write what was in *F*. And of the large omission after *sic* a careful inspection of *F* still reveals *ad nri* (= *nostri*) *s. dinem q(ui) u.re.*¹ This goes to show that the scribe of ϕ was not painstaking. Nor was he a conscientious scribe. For he did not hesitate to write what he did not actually see, as may be seen from his inserting a word between *vulnera* and *lancea*,² where *F* has *non sunt tota dentium uul. lancea mali Thrasilli*, etc. The gap which occurs between *uul* and *lancea* is at the beginning of a line, and it is mathematically demonstrable that only four letters preceded *lancea*. They are, of course, *nera*. But the scribe of ϕ added *sed* before *lancea* because the sense seemed to him to require it, and he did not stop to measure the space to see if it could possibly have been there. This helps one to form an idea of his fidelity to his exemplar. That he takes other liberties with his original may be seen from his constantly writing *Tharsillus* for *F*'s *Thrasillus*, and *Alepolemus* for *Tlepolemus*. We must not suppose that the scribe of ϕ failed to distinguish between *a* and *t*, which in Beneventan are liable to confusion. He saw that *F* had *t* in *Tlepolemus*, but apparently

¹ Professor E. Rostagno very kindly examined this passage for me in both manuscripts.

² See fol. 160^v, col. 1, ll. 6-7. This leaf is

reproduced in Helvia's edition of the *Florida* (Leipsic, 1910).

regarded
changes
lated for
to succum
bere, ϕ a
 ϕ carites.
Where *F*
F has iter
 ϕ nullo
impossibl
the flow c

Furti
from an
160^r-160^v
ultu non
pau. Ag
noctes ins
words et
the next
This restr
where *F*
the missi
reading of

The
correspon
an estima
which, ow
the first
The pages
read in th
parchmen
the absorb
the numer
of legible
of the skin
of the pa
centuries
century M
example i
end of th
faded lette

regarded it as an error for *a* by the scribe of *F*. The scribe of ϕ invariably changes the better spelling *ae* (the *e* with cedilla of *F*) to *e*, and the unassimilated form of compound verbs to the assimilated (*adfixit* to *affixit*, *subcumbens* to *succumbens*, *adquiescas* to *acquiescas*, etc.). *F* has *bacchata*, ϕ *bachata*; *F* *adhibere*, ϕ *adibere*; *F* *hilaro*, ϕ *hylaro*; *F* has *formonsus*, ϕ *formosus*; *F* *charites*, ϕ *carites*. Here and there ϕ inverts the order in *F* or makes slight additions. Where *F* has *uerum religiosae necessitati*, ϕ has *uerum etiam necessitati religiose*; *F* has *iterans*, ϕ *reiterans*; *F* *mortis meae*, ϕ *mee mortis*; *F* *nullo lumine conscio*, ϕ *nullo conscio lumine*. Where *F* has (*Met.* VIII. 10, Helm 185. 9) the impossible *nec ecce est mihi*, the scribe of ϕ , without the least interruption in the flow of his writing, gives us the correct *necesse est mihi*.

Further illustration of the method followed by the scribe of ϕ is to be had from an examination of his treatment of the lacuna which occurs in folio 160^r-160^v of his exemplar (*Met.* VIII. 7-8, ed. Helm 182, 8-15). Where *F* has *nultu non quidem hilaro, uerum . . . lo sereniore*, the scribe of ϕ promptly supplied *pau*. Again, where *F* has *luctu ac maerore carpebat animum tos totasque noctes insumebat l derio*, the scribe of ϕ supplied after *animum* the words *et dies to*, which is obviously right. But he did not venture to supply the next omission, though the ending *derio* must have suggested *desiderio*. This restraint on his part must be placed to his credit. And a few lines above, where *F* has *iubebatur, uiuentium nia*, the scribe of ϕ makes no effort to guess the missing two letters, but leaves space for them and writes *ma*—his misreading of *nia*.

The above comparison of two pages in *F* (fols. 160^r-160^v) with the corresponding two pages of ϕ (fols. 53^r-53^v) is sufficient to enable us to form an estimate of the degree of confidence one may attach to those readings which, owing to their faded condition in *F*, depend solely on the authority of the first hand in ϕ . And here palaeography may give a word of warning. The pages in *F* which are now illegible, or almost so, were already hard to read in the thirteenth century. It seems that the manner of preparing the parchment at Monte Cassino in the eleventh century was such as to reduce the absorbing quality of the flesh side of the parchment. This accounts for the numerous eleventh-century MSS. from Monte Cassino in which two sides of legible script alternate with two that are faded. The ink on the hair-side of the skin has weathered the centuries well, but has scaled off the flesh-side of the parchment. That the defacement took place within a couple of centuries after the MSS. were written may be seen from the fact that eleventh-century MSS. had to be retouched in the thirteenth century. An excellent example is furnished by Laur. 68.2 itself, which on fols. 102^v and 103^r (the end of the Tacitus) show thirteenth-century Beneventan letters covering the faded letters of the eleventh century.¹

¹ Cf. E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script*, pp. 286 sq.

THE DATE OF ϕ .

The trustworthiness of ϕ has been impugned to some extent by Professor Rossbach's claim that it is a humanistic copy purposely written to resemble Beneventan. Professor Rossbach has expressed this view of ϕ on a number of occasions,¹ and has recently reiterated it in his review of Butler and Owen's edition of Apuleius' *Apologia* (Oxford, 1914).² This view cannot be left unchallenged. Ever since Bandini, in 1764, in his catalogue of Laurentian Latin MSS. ascribed ϕ to the twelfth century, scholars have been in the habit of using that date. Some editors, it is true (as Van der Vliet and Helm), influenced, perhaps, by Professor Rossbach's arguments, refrained from committing themselves. In my book on the Beneventan script, where ϕ is cited a number of times, it is regularly ascribed to the thirteenth century. Thus it is clear that I regard ϕ as a genuine Beneventan MS. and not a humanistic *tour de force*.

If we examine the grounds on which Professor Rossbach bases his view, we find that his suspicions were aroused by the fact that the opening leaves of ϕ are in ordinary minuscule, and the so-called Lombardic writing does not begin before fol. 5. But there is nothing peculiar or striking in this to anyone familiar with the MSS. of Southern Italy. It is not at all rare to find both Beneventan and ordinary minuscule written by contemporary scribes in one and the same MS. If a scribe who had learned his writing outside of the Beneventan zone happened to be collaborating on a MS. with a Beneventan scribe, the result had to be a MS. of the mixed character of ϕ . Further details and evidence will be found in Chap. V. of the Beneventan script, where the whole question is treated at length.

The next point adduced by Professor Rossbach is the strange look of the script, which to him is an all-too-careful and yet insufficiently exact copy of Beneventan. The unfamiliar aspect of ϕ , however, is due to the fact that it was written at a time when Beneventan was losing ground, when its century-old traditions were beginning to totter, and when innovations borrowed from ordinary minuscule were being freely adopted. This accounts for the frequent use of ordinary minuscule *a*, for the use of the horizontal stroke as well as the 3-stroke for omitted *m*, for the lapses in the use of *i*-longa, the *fi*-ligature and the Beneventan interrogation-point. But in all this ϕ does not stand alone. A number of other thirteenth-century MSS. show a similar mixture of style and uncertainty in usage, an excellent case in point being furnished by the patristic MS. Rome Sessorian. 32 (2093). Another reason why the script of ϕ seems unfamiliar lies in the roundness of its characters. This type of writing was common in Bari and the vicinity, and it is quite likely that the scribe of ϕ came from that region. Professor Rossbach finds corroboration in the greyish tint of the ink and the clearness of the parchment. Here I must

¹ Cf. *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* XVII. (1897), col. 1041; *ibid.* XX. (1900), col. 1479.

² *Ibid.* XXXVI. (1916), col. 936.

UNIQU
plead ign
MSS., I
They ma
Further
 ϕ , which,
Assuming
argument
of *F*, a ge
viations i
from havi
Acco
which rep
the uninit
say that
eleventh-c
 ϕ , on the
later cent
aniam (*an*
F has *ut*
for *quidem*
abbreviati
that these
century I
Beneventa
must deci
imitation,
century ex
not point
choose his
best perio
Rossbach
of Tacitus
similar R
must adm
that they
stated tha
Renaissan
true of ϕ
fide antiqu

OXFORD.

¹ Not only
typical of the
graphic featu

² I have

plead ignorance. Although I have examined nearly all extant Beneventan MSS., I have not found that ink or parchment are safe or helpful criteria. They may easily become so by the aid of chemistry and the microscope. Further evidence for his view Professor Rossbach finds in the abbreviations of ϕ , which, he claims, are fewer in number than in genuine Beneventan products. Assuming the truth of the statement, it would seem to make an unconvincing argument. But it is not true. As a simple test, I noted all the abbreviations of *F*, a genuine Beneventan product, on fol. 160^r and 160^v, and all the abbreviations in the corresponding text of ϕ (fols. 53^r and 53^v), and find that ϕ , far from having less abbreviations than *F*, has actually dozens more on each page.

According to Professor Rossbach, ϕ is one of a class of Renaissance MSS. which reproduce the features of the exemplar, and are a stumbling block to the uninitiated. The latter part of the statement is apparently true; but to say that ϕ reproduces the features of its exemplar *F* is absurd. *F* is an eleventh-century MS., with characters and abbreviations typical of that century. ϕ , on the other hand, has both the script and the abbreviations of a distinctly later century. If ϕ is imitating *F*, why does it have \overline{no} (*non*) where *F* has \overline{n} ; \overline{aniam} (*animam*) where *F* has \overline{amam} ; \overline{co} (*con*) where *F* has \overline{c} ; $\overline{u\bar{b}}$ (*uerbia*) where *F* has $\overline{u\bar{b}}$; \overline{q} (*quod*) where *F* has $\overline{q\bar{d}}$; \overline{t} (*uel*) where *F* has \overline{ut} ; the monogram for *quidem* where *F* has three letters? And how account for the numerous abbreviations in ϕ which are altogether absent from *F*? How does it happen that these abbreviations are the very symbols we find in twelfth and thirteenth-century Beneventan MSS.? The explanation is simple enough. ϕ is a Beneventan MS. of about the year 1200. For if a man imitate a script he must decide upon the period he is to imitate. If one insists that ϕ is an imitation, it must be not of an eleventh-century exemplar, but of a thirteenth-century exemplar.¹ As no such exemplar existed, ϕ is no imitation. I need not point out that a humanist wishing to imitate Beneventan would hardly choose his model from the worst period of the script, when a model from the best period was at hand in the very MS. he wished to copy. When Professor Rossbach further cites the *Guelferbytanus* of Tibullus, the *Leidensis Perizonianus* of Tacitus, and the *Leidensis Vossianus* of the *Periochae* of Livy as examples of similar Renaissance imitations ('von ähnlich geschriebenen Codices') one must admit that the three MSS. mentioned are Renaissance products, and that they do attempt to revive an earlier stage of writing; but it must also be stated that no one with knowledge of Latin MSS. can fail to detect the Renaissance earmarks in their script and decoration. The very opposite is true of ϕ : no one with experience of Latin MSS. is likely to question its *bona fide* antiquity.²

E. A. LOWE.

OXFORD.

¹ Not only are script and abbreviations in ϕ typical of the thirteenth century, but all other graphic features are true to type.

² I have recently consulted the opinion of

Professor Rostagno and Professor Schiaparelli, two excellent connoisseurs of Italian MSS. They both ascribe ϕ to the twelfth century.

VERGIL'S *RES ROMANAE*.

DONATUS, after enumerating Vergil's early poems, proceeds (*Vita Verg.* 19): 'Mox cum res Romanas inchoasset, offensus materia, ad Bucolica transiit.' We have learned to distrust such statements about Vergil's early life, having discovered that an all too literal interpretation of the *Bucolics* provided a large part of Suetonius' data. The line quoted above may be nothing but an inference from *Eclogue* VI. 3:

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
uellit et admonuit, etc.

Servius' comment shows how uncertain were the traditional data about this early attempt at an epic: 'Significat aut Aeneidem aut gesta regum Albanorum.' Since Servius knows so little about it, there is no profit in quoting Servius auctus (*alii Scyllam*), or Philargyrius (*Aeneidos libros*) or the Bern scholia. Now that criticism has succeeded in removing the long-entertained doubts regarding the authenticity of the *Culex*, the *Ciris*, and the fourteen poems *Catalepton*,¹ the safest way to reconstruct Vergil's biography is to proceed anew from the basis of the *Appendix Vergiliana* and the *Bucolics*, instead of accepting outright the statements of the scholiasts, who used practically only the *Bucolics*.

The ninth *Catalepton*, written in 42 B.C., seems to suggest (l. 62) that Vergil entertained an ambition to rival the Greeks with a *patrio carmine*. The fourteenth *Catalepton* carries us farther. I have shown elsewhere that every tangible clue in the *Catalepton* leads us back to the period before the *Bucolics*, and that, therefore, we should suppose the book closed before 41 B.C. In style and substance the poem is somewhat too naïve to accept as the work of Vergil's maturity; the reference to Sorrento accords well with Vergil's student days before Siro's death, and the offering of flowers for inspiration (l. 6) reminds us of the *Ciris* (l. 96). But the most definite reference is found in l. 11:

adsis, o Cytherea: tuus te Caesar Olympo
. uocat.

It was on September 26, in 46 B.C., that Caesar so strikingly called attention to his claims of descent from Venus and Aeneas by dedicating a temple to Venus Genetrix. It was on that day that Caesar called Venus from heaven to

¹ I have tried to summarize the conclusions in *Class. Phil.*, 1920, Nos. I.-II.

dwell in h
to Vergil t

And we ca
for the fou
In the

His first s
a poem w
that date a
which he m
Donatus, t
says that V
How
Vergil's ow
wars in Ita

and the si
Furthermo
(l. 122) wo
scene of th
have forgot
It is, l
profit most
before Caes
referred to

¹ See Dio, X
Klio XI. 130, f
² The contra
and his later
therefore, acce
was the first
and nature of

dwelt in her new temple.¹ This may have been the act that first suggested to Vergil the thought of writing the epic of

Troius Aeneas Romana per oppida digno
 carmine

And we can hardly hesitate to accept an early date after September, 46 B.C., for the fourteenth *Catalepton*.

In the light of that poem the first lines of the sixth *Eclogue* become clear:

prima Syracosio dignata est ludere uersu
 nostra, nec erubuit siluas habitare, Thalia.
 cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
 uellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
 pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen.'

His first song,² also inspired by Thalia, was the *Culex* written in 48 B.C., a poem which was considered a pastoral by Vergil and Horace. Between that date and the writing of the *Eclogues* falls the first effort at *reges et proelia*, which he mentions here to excuse his failure to sing the deeds of Varus (l. 7). Donatus, therefore, seems after all to preserve an accurate tradition when he says that Vergil had first attempted a Roman epic before he wrote the *Eclogues*.

How far this first attempt proceeded we shall probably not know. Vergil's own words would imply that his early effort centred about Aeneas' wars in Italy; the fourteenth *Catalepton*,

Troius Aeneas Romana per oppida digno,

and the sixth *Eclogue* (*reges et proelia*) are rather explicit on this point. Furthermore, the reference of Celaeno's omen to Anchises in the seventh book (l. 122) would indicate that this part at least was written before the harpy-scene of the third; for the latter is so extensive that the poet could hardly have forgotten it.³

It is, however, in reading the first and fifth books that I think we may profit most by keeping in mind the fact that the poet had begun the *Aeneid* before Caesar's death. In Book I. 286 sqq. occurs a passage which Servius referred to Julius Caesar. It reads:

nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,
 imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
 Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.
 hunc tu olim caelo, spoliis Orientis onustum,
 accipies securus; uocabitur hic quoque uotis.

¹ See Dio, XLIII. 22; Appian, II. 102; Heinen, *Klio* XI. 130, for references.

² The contrast lies between Vergil's first song and his later attempts at an epic. We cannot, therefore, accept the more usual rendering 'Mine was the first muse that deigned.' For the date and nature of the *Culex* see *Class. Phil.*, 1920, 23.

³ Because of the reference in Propertius (II. 24) and also of internal evidence provided by the *Aeneid*, many scholars hold that the seventh book was written earlier than the first six; cf. G. Hirst, *An Attempt to Date the Composition of Aen. VII.*, *Class. Quart.*, 1916, 87.

Very few modern writers have dared accept Servius' judgment here, and yet if we may think of these lines as adapted from (say) an original dedication to Julius Caesar written about 45 B.C. the difficulties of the commentators will vanish. The facts that Vergil seems to have in mind are these: In September, 46 B.C., Julius Caesar, after returning from Thapsus, celebrated his four great triumphs over Gaul, Egypt, Pontus, and Africa, displaying loads of booty such as had never before been seen at Rome. He then gave an extended series of athletic games, of the kind described in Vergil's fifth book, including a restoration of the ancient *ludus Troiae*. When these were over he dedicated the temple of Venus Genetrix, thereby publicly announcing his descent from Venus, and presently proclaimed his own superhuman rank more explicitly by placing a statue of himself among the gods on the Capitoline (Dio, XLIII. 14-22). Are not the phrases *imperium Oceano* and *spoliis Orientis onustum* a direct reference to this triumph, which, of course, Vergil saw? And did not these dedications inspire the prophecy *uocabitur hic quoque notis*? Be that as it may, it is difficult to refuse credence to Servius in this case, for Vergil here (I. 267-274 and 288) accepts Julius Caesar's claim of descent from Iulus, whereas in the sixth book, in speaking of the descent of the royal Roman line, he derives it, as was regularly done in Augustus' day, from Silvius, the son of Aeneas and Lavinia (VI. 763 sqq.). We must notice also that in the *Aeneid* as in the *Georgics* Augustus is regularly called 'Augustus Caesar' or 'Caesar,' whereas in the only other reference to Julius in the *Aeneid* the poet explicitly points to him by saying 'Caesar et omnis Iuli progenies' (VI. 789).

Servius, therefore, seems to be right in regarding Julius as the subject of the passage in the first book, and it follows that the passage contains memories of the year 46 B.C., whether or not the lines were, as I suggest, first written soon after Caesar's triumph.

The fifth book also, despite the fact that its beginning and end show a late hand, contains much that can best be brought into connexion with Vergil's earlier years. It is, for instance, easier to comprehend the poet's references to Memmius, Catiline, and Cluentius in the forties than twenty years later. Vergil's strange comparison of Messalla to the *superbus Eryx* in *Catalepton IX.*, written in 42 B.C.,¹ is also readily explained if we may assume that he has recently studied the Eryx myth in preparation for the contest of Book V. (ll. 392-420). The poet's enthusiasm for the *ludus Troiae* is well understood as a description of what he saw at Caesar's reintroduction of the spectacle in 46. At Caesar's games Octavian, then sixteen years of age, must have led one of the troops: in the fifth book Atys, the ancestor of Octavian's maternal line, led one column by the side of Iulus:

alter Atys, genus unde Atii duxere Latini (l. 568).

Then, too, marks of youth pervade the substance of the book. The question-

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, 1920, 11.

able witti
but there
to conter
illusion.
Sergii, a
conspirac
eagerness
(V. 173).
is filled v
connected
connexion
names fir
was comp
furnished

Final

Acestes'
importance
of the B
campaign
he ascend
his statue
Segesta w
of that k
he could
of Aeneas
part of th
of the obs

It wo
were part
discussed
the *Ciris*,
youth wri
as we may
has more
mature w
is that Ve
did of the

JOHNS F

¹ Cf. *Ed.*
with *Ciris* 3
Georg. I. 40f

able witticisms might perhaps be attributed to an attempt to relieve the strain, but there is an unusual amount of Homeric imitation and inartistic allusion to contemporaries which, as in the youthful *Bucolics*, destroys the dramatic illusion. Thus, Vergil not only dwells upon the ancestry of the Memmii, Sergii, and Cluentii, but insists upon reminding the reader of Catiline's conspiracy in the *Sergestus*, *furens animi* who dashes upon the rock in his mad eagerness to win, and obtrudes etymology in the phrase *segnem Menoeten* (V. 173). One is tempted to suspect that the whole narrative of the boar-trace is filled with pragmatic allusions. If the characters of his epic must be connected with well-known Roman families, it is at least interesting that the connexions are indicated in the fifth book, and not in the passages where the names first meet the reader. Does it not appear that the body of the book was composed long before the rest, and then left at the poet's death not quite furnished to the fastidious taste of a later day?

Finally, I would suggest that the strange and still unexplained omen of Acestes' burning arrow in ll. 520 sqq. probably refers to some event of importance to Segesta in the same year, 46 B.C. We are told by the author of the *Bellum Africanum* that Caesar mustered his troops for the African campaign at Lilybaeum in the winter of 47. We are not told that while there he ascended the mountain, offered sacrifices to Venus Erycina, and ordered his statue to be placed in her temple, or that he gave favours to the people of Segesta who had the care of that temple. But he probably did something of that kind, for as he had already vowed his temple to Venus Genetrix he could hardly have remained eight days at Lilybaeum so near the shrine of Aeneas' Venus without some act of filial devotion. If Vergil wrote any part of the fifth book in or soon after 46 this would seem to be the solution of the obscure passage in question.

It would be futile to attempt to pick out definite lines and claim that these were parts of the youthful poem. Indeed, the artistry of most of the verses discussed is, as any reader will notice, more on the plane of the later work than the *Ciris*, written about 47-3 B.C. It is safe to say that Vergil did not in his youth write the sonorous lines of *Aen.* I. 286-290 just as they now stand. But as we may learn from the *Ciris*, which Vergil attempted to suppress, no poet has more successfully retouched lines written in youth and fitted them into mature work without leaving a trace of the process. All that I would assume is that Vergil made the same kind of use of his fragmentary *Res Romanae* as he did of the *Ciris*.¹

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

¹ Cf. *Ecl.* IV. 47 with *Ciris* 125; *Ecl.* IV. 49 with *Ciris* 398; *Ecl.* VIII. 41 with *Ciris* 430; *Georg.* I. 406-9 with *Ciris* 538-41; *Aen.* II. 405

with *Ciris* 402; *Aen.* III. 74 with *Ciris* 474. See Vollmer's edition of the *Ciris* for these and other references.

CATVLLVS AND HORACE ON SVFFENVS AND ALFENVS.

ALFENVS VARVS of Cremona, a quondam friend of Catullus, studied law with the great Seruius Sulpicius—some of whose lectures he published—served to the advantage of Vergil as land commissioner in Cisalpine Gaul,¹ became *consul suffectus* in 39 B.C., and provided Horace with the point of a joke. He seems also—hence this note—to have been the versifier whom Catullus calls Suffenus in c. 14 and 22. If he is, we have here a somewhat rare instance of Horace's adapting to his own use a suggestion from Catullus.

In *Sermo* I. 3, 130, Horace cites the example of Alfenus, once cobbler, recently consul, in pretended support of the Stoic paradox that the wise man alone is the universal expert. Though Alfenus, the pettifogger, long ago closed his shop, he has never outgrown being a cobbler.

Vt Alfenus uaffer omni
abiecto instrumento artis clausaque taberna
sutor erat.

Porphyrio explains the reference: 'Vrbane autem Alfenum Varum Cremonensem deridet, qui, abiecta sutrina quam in municipio suo exercuerat, Romam petit, magistroque usus Sulpicio iuris consulto ad tantam scientiam peruenit ut et consulatum gereret et publico funere efferretur.'

Of course we need not interpret *sutor* too literally. It is not likely that Octavian would have raised an actual cobbler to the consulship. If the father of Alfenus was a colonial of the usual type found in the Po Valley, he doubtless invested the surplus earnings of his farm in urban shops and factories. At Cremona, this would hardly cause any social embarrassment, provided the shops brought good returns. At Rome, however, where the boy was sent to study law, a young man aspiring to position needed to have a generation or two between himself and a trade. Alfenus, apparently of Catullus' age (Cat. 30), associated with the young men about town in his early youth, which would seem to prove that he had never sat at the cobbler's bench. But the source of his ready money became the talk of the city. He was a *terrae filius* in the eyes of Roman nobles, and became, like Ventidius, a standing example of a class, very rare at Rome, that succeeded in breaking from the industrial

¹ Servius Dan, *ad Ecl.* IX. 27: 'blanditur Alfeno Varo, qui, Pollione fugato, legatus Transpadanis praepositus ab Augusto'; Probi *Vita Verg.*: 'postea restitutus beneficio Alpheni

Vari, Asinii Pollionis et Cornelii Galli.' The accuracy of these statements has been questioned repeatedly in recent essays.

group into
loose gen
station, a
sutrina v
The
The twen

The poin
Suffenus
write poe
in the ep
betrays h
Have
similarity
age. Bot
Alfenus¹
of both s
interprete
'That fel
Varus wa
Furtherm
his low bi
seems no
Alfenus, a
The clue
they were
mentary

¹ licet iuri

group into the political nobility. It may even be that 'cobbler' is here but a loose generalization, common from Socrates' day, to designate a man of humble station, and that Porphyrio, with his usual literal-mindedness, fastened upon *sutrina* with no better evidence than that of this text.

The scribbler Suffenus of Catullus 14 and 22 seems to be this very Alfenus. The twenty-second poem reads in part :

Suffenus iste, Vare, quem probe nosti,
homo est uenustus et dicax et urbanus,
idemque longe plurimos facit uersus.
puto esse ego illi milia aut decem aut plura
perscripta, nec sic, ut fit, in palimpsesto
relata: chartae regiae, noui libri,
noui umbilici, lora, rubra membrana,
derecta plumbo et pumice omnia aequata.
haec cum legas tu, bellus ille et urbanus
Suffenus unus caprimulgus aut fossor
rursus uidetur: tantum abhorret ac mutat.
hoc quid putemus esse? qui modo scurra
aut si quid hac re tritius uidebatur,
idem infaceto est infacetior rure
simul poemata attigit.

The point of this passage is much the same as in Horace's taunt: 'Your Suffenus is, to be sure, a man of wit and polite manners, but when he tries to write poetry he becomes what he was before, a country bumpkin.' The sting in the epigram lies in *rursus*. Suffenus reverts to type when he writes: he betrays his provenance.

Have not the two poets chosen the very same man? The points of similarity are at least numerous. Suffenus and Alfenus were of about the same age. Both were poets of a kind, Suffenus according to Catullus 14 and 22, Alfenus¹ according to Servius Dan. on Vergil, *Ecl.* IX. 35. The cognomen of both seems to be Varus, for *Suffenus iste, Vare* (Cat. 22, 1) is most readily interpreted: 'Suffenus, who bears your name, *Varus*.' If, however, it means 'That fellow-townsmen of yours,' it comes to the same thing, for Quintilius Varus was also from Cremona; and Catullus adds: 'quem probe nosti.' Furthermore, Suffenus is, as we have said, twitted for unintentionally betraying his low birth, as was Alfenus in Horace. Finally, the name Suffenus, which seems not to be found except in Catullus, is apparently a slight perversion of Alfenus, as Horace's 'Alfenus uaffer' is but a slight alteration of Alfenus Varus. The clue lies in the suggestion of ἀλφύ = 'profit.' The Romans, bilingual as they were, readily found Greek wordplays in names (see Friedrich's commentary on Cat. 95, 5). I do not know whether it has been noticed that

¹ licet iuris consultus et successor Seruii Sulpicii esset, etiam carmina aliqua composuisse dicitur.

Horace's *fenerator Alfius* (*Epode* II.) grew out of the word-play ἀλφή = 'fenus,' but I have long felt that the position of the words betrayed the poet's intention. *Suffenus* then seems to be adopted as the opposite of *Alfenus*, in memory of expressions like *fenore obrutus*, *oppressus*, etc. There is then a very strong case in favour of identifying the two men.

This identification may help in solving some other standing puzzles in Catullus. If Suffenus of 22 is Alfenus, then the person addressed as *Vare* is definitely not Alfenus. The likelihood that he is Quintilius Varus of Cremona grows when we give heed to *iste*. Furthermore, if this Suffenus is Alfenus Varus, the probability is very strong that the Alfenus of *Carmen* 30 is also. Finally, if the man addressed as *Vare* in 22 is Quintilius Varus and not Alfenus, the Varus of *Carmen* 10, also a jovial friend, is all the more likely to be Quintilius. When we remember the position that Quintilius held with Vergil and Horace it is of some interest to find on what footing he stood with Catullus. If no one else attracted Horace's attention to Catullus' joke on Alfenus, we trust that Quintilius, the recipient of the poem, would have referred to it.

Finally, I would suggest that Alfenus Varus now stands out as a man who was deeply interested in poetry in his youth, even though he failed to satisfy the fastidious taste of Catullus. This fact makes it all the more likely that he took an interest in the youthful Vergil and that the scholium which credits him with aiding Vergil is not as improbable as it has seemed to some critics. There is little reason to doubt that he is the Varus of the ninth *Eclogue*.¹

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

TENNEY FRANK.

¹ The Varus of the sixth *Eclogue* seems to be Quintilius, see *Class. Phil.*, 1920, pp. 114, 115.

I. L.
the curre
mistaken
IE. plēyo-
pányas an
prāyas an
but, by a
<flā-(y)i
Germanic
IE. plōis
aes <aye
minus, plu
IF. II. 5
πολύ. A
The evid
possible,
ū and ī.
Varro LI
(double s
στος = Av
changed,
2. A
in the ep
transcript

¹ A solit
seems to
Greek λών
hiatus in
of λών fro
complacenc
and, in my
with λών.
parative λώ
secondary ā
² In his L
Cicero had
a boy. Arc
inscriptions
the inconsis
Faliscan C
guild of lon
suspicion to

'fenus,'
ention.
emory of
ng case

zzles in
Vare is
remona
Alfenus
is also.
Alfenus,
e Quin-
gil and
atullus.
nus, we
t.

a man
illed to
e likely
which
o some
e ninth

ANK.

115.

SCIPIONIC FORGERIES.

1. LATIN 'PLVS.'—To begin somewhat remotely, I am not satisfied with the current explanation of Lat. *plus*. As regards *pleores*, to pass over Cuny's mistaken derivation in *MSL*. 16. 322, the explanation from *plēyōses* is correct—IE. *plēyo-* (in Arm. *li*, 'full') : *plēyos* :: Sk. *nāvya* : compv. *nāvya*s, cf. *pānya* : *pānya*s and *tāvya* : *tāvya*s. IE. *plēyes* also appears, not only in Sanskrit as *prāyas* and (from *plēyen*) in *πλε(ι)-ων* (*ei* after suplv. *πλεϊ-στος* : Av. *fraē-šta*), but, by a quite rigorous phonetic, in O.Norse *fleiri*, from a primate *flaiz-an* <*flā-(y)iz-* <*plē-yes-*; cf. Lappish *sājet* 'sow,' borrowed from a North Germanic verb-stem *sā-ya* <IE. *sē-ye/o*. This leaves the *o*-grade stem IE. *plōis* high and dry, for Lat. *ploes-*, if admitted, will come from *plōyes*¹ (cf. *aes* <*ayes*). Like *minus*, and in point of usage even more strikingly than *minus*, *plus* is a neuter substantive. I start for *plus*, as Brugmann once did (cf. *IF*. 11. 93), from IE. *plewes* (cf. Lat. *iūs* <*iewes* : *ionestod*), root *p(e)leu* in *πολύ*. After *plūs* came *plūres* *plūrimus* as from *minus* came *minores* *minimus*. The evidence of Festus' *plisima* | *plurima* is not evidence for *plōis*. It is not possible, under the same circumstances, for IE. *ōi* to have yielded Latin *ū* and *ī*. Accordingly, if we do not merely correct *plisima* to *plusima*, after Varro *LL*. 7. 27, we may restore haplographic or haplologic *pl[us]is(s)ima* (double superlative like *postremissimus*). Or in view of the equation *πλεϊ-στος* = Av. *fraē-šta* I would reconstruct *plisima* from *plei-soma*—subsequently changed, after *plūs*, to *plūrima*.

2. ARCHAIZING *oi* FOR *ū*.—In *BB*. 26. 137 Hoffmann demonstrated that, in the epigraphic locution *loidos fecerunt*, *loidos* is an erroneous archaistic transcription for *lūdos*² (: *χλεύ-η*; cf., unless the Greek of Philo and the

¹ A solitary deflected *o*-grade comparative seems to me quite inadmissible. Of course Greek *λῶιον* has *ω*, but not a gradation *ō*. The hiatus in *ωι* categorically forbids the derivation of *λῶιον* from *(w)lē/ō*, in spite of Boisacq's easy complacency. The truth still remains that *λῶιον* and, in my opinion, Arm. *lav* 'better' belong with *λαῖω*. To judge by the strong grade comparative *λῶιον*, the root was an *ō/ā(p)* root, with secondary *ā* in *λαῖα*, etc.

² In his *Laws*, 3. 7, Cicero wrote *ludorum*, and Cicero had learned the XII. Tables by heart as a boy. Archaisms were often intended to make inscriptions more solemn. Thus we account for the inconsistent forms of the inscription of the Faliscan Cooks (Diehl, No. 102), doubtless a guild of long standing. Ground for objective suspicion touching the age of this inscription is

furnished by the three forms of P (see Zvetaieff's apograph, *Inscr. Ital.*, p. 72). Besides, the language, with all its vagaries, is Latin and not Faliscan. Of inconsistencies I note the following: (1) *gonlegium* X *comuinia* (G/C), (2) *dederunt* X *coiraueront* (*u/o*, cf. neuter *huc* for *hoc*), (3) *ueitam* X *comuinia* (*ei/i*), (4) *ququei* X *quolundam* (*qu/quo* for *co*), (5) *actatei* X *sai[pi]sume* (*ai/ae*), (6) *aciptum* (*i* for *e*), (7) nom. pl. *Falesce* X *ququei*. We also have (8) *oi* for *ū* in *loidos* and *coiraueront*; cf. *loidos* (but *murum*) and *coirauerunt* in No. 179 (108 B.C.). There is nothing on the 'titulus' of No. 102 that is older than the like portions of No. 179 (e.g. nom. pl. *magistreis* on both). The permanence of the guild of Faliscan cooks need not surprise us, nor the antiquarian felicities and infelicities of their diction (Dogberryese)

Anthology is a Latinism, *ludos aliquem facere* with *χλευήν τινα ποιεῖν*), from pre-Lat. *ghleu-d(h)*.¹ The force of Hoffmann's argument has been entirely lost on Walde and Stolz. It lies in the objection to the *o*-grade present (*ludo* <*loido*). As back formations from augmented preterits (cf. *ἐμολον ἔπορον*) we have a few such presents, but there are no certain Latin examples (*molo* is from *melo melont*—cf. *mola*—and does not accord in vocalism with Gothic *malan*²) and no proof that Latin ever had augmented preterits. Certainly *uolt* has IE. *e* and *né uolim* does not prove IE. *uolim* (pace Solmsen ap. Meillet, *MSL.* 19. 188). Walde further fails in his attempt to limit Lat. *lī* <*loi* to cases where *b* follows (cf. *līquit*: Gothic *laihwa*). As a word etymology, Lat. *lira* (<*loisā*: O.Bulg. *lěchŭ* (<*loisos*) is impeccable, and to dodge the issue by deriving *lira* from *leisa* is a mere subterfuge. Italic *loisa* is further attested in Osc. *luisarifs*, properly connected by Buecheler with *lira*. The **Liralia*³ would be offerings for or in the furrows, a sort of Ambarvalia. Thus we establish the conclusion that Lat. *lira* came from *loisa*, and may the better believe that **līdos* would be the only possible product of *loidos*. What is true for *lois-* is probably true for *plōis*, viz. that it must have yielded **plis* and not *plus*. Accordingly, if *plurimus* is right, there is no reason to admit *plōisimos*. When we connect Virgil, *G.* 4. 160 (*lentum de cortice gluten*) with the general use of resins for cements, it is quite open to us to deny all connexion of *gluten* with *γλοιός*. Thus *gluten* was a resin or pitch before it was a glue. On the root *gleu* 'form drops, balls,' etc., see Walde s.v. *gluo*. Plautine *ad-glu-t-inant* is particularly near Lith. *glaudūs* 'snug,' 'lying close to' in sense.

3. EPITAPHS OF THE TWO OLDEST SCIPIOS.—I am now going to try to show that these inscriptions are of a much later date than has been hitherto supposed, and that their language is not archaic but archaistic. To begin with a definite statement, I attribute these epitaphs to Scipio Metellus, the last father-in-law of Pompeius, and one of the last Pompeians to hold out against Caesar. We know from Cicero (*Att.* 6. 1. 17) that this Scipio filled the Capitol with a squadron of gilt equestrian statues of his ancestors, and that he sadly blundered in assigning titles of office to his own great-grandfather. At a time when, for political reasons, Caesar was parading his purely imaginary descent from Aeneas and Venus, for like motives Scipio Metellus was reviving before the public his long line of historical ancestors, twenty-one

¹ Hesychian *λίγει* · *παλίγει* (*λιγ-~~ligy~~*) belongs with Goth. *leihan* 'hop.'

² In the interplay between the roots *ale* (*ālelo*) and *mel* a stage *mal* arose, cf. *μάλεπον* after *ἀλεπον*. But *a-~~o~~* presents seem to have been productive in Gothic.

³ Buecheler also brought into this group the riddlesome Umbr. *disleral insust* (=inritum fecerit), wherein *e* may come from IE. *ē* or *ei*, but not from *oi*. Perhaps, if I may venture on a conjecture, that accounts for only part of the word, *-lera-* is to be connected with OHG. *lāri* (*lāryō-*, *inanis*): *λήρος* (*inania verba*). [Varro

decided for *delirus* as against *deleerus*, see Funaioli, *Gram. Rom. Frag.*, p. 295.] It suits the context well enough if *disleral insust* be defined by 'to vitiate a sacrifice by idle talk, muttering.' Perhaps *-leral insust* is from *lerali* 'inane'+a form of *inquit*. [It is not impossible that, as we use Ital. *bravo*, the Umbrians had picked up *λήρος* from Greek traders.] As for the Campanian proper name *Loisios*, its *oi* may represent *u* in the Greek name *Λούσιος*; see Lindsay, *LL.* p. 36, Marouzeau in *MSL.* 17. 272, adding *Cloetemestra* and *Moesia*.

of whom I
refurbishing
tombs and

4. To
to make th
writer of i
Livius And
to study L
a professe
Cicero lea
attached a
in Funaiol
teacher of
look in p
I note from
and such
further dat
the rôle p
might him
epitaphs r
better than
Lex Tappu
to the time
myself bo
orthograph
to that tim
will be suc
to write in
could, if th
stretches.

5. Th
tombs nev
suggested.
taken up
sq. Woelff
were not
a half-cen
According
Language,
did more
epitaphs v

¹ Going b
the merry tal
it was broug
public, that s

of whom had been consuls in the 86 years 219-133 B.C. Scipio's interest in refurbishing them before the Romans might also have taken him to their tombs and set him to restoring or supplying anew their epitaphs.

4. To give the new epitaphs value as historical evidence it was advisable to make them archaic. Unless Scipio did it himself, he called in a *poeta* or writer of inscriptions, and set him to work upon Saturnians in the fashion of Livius Andronicus. Nor was this a difficult task. Later on Horace still had to study Livius by dictation. Varro, contemporary with Scipio Metellus, was a professed amateur of Old Latin and made large collections of material. Cicero learned by heart the XII. Tables. For the even exaggerated value attached at that time to grammatical studies see the citation (Suetonius-Varro) in Funaioli, *op. cit.* p. xiii, where also is recorded the high price paid to a teacher of Oscan at Rome. To such grammarians and antiquarians we might look in part for the collections available to Verrius Flaccus and Festus. I note from Festus minute statements like the record of Plautine *aliae* for *alii* and such an ancient orthography as *ab oloes*. Priscian (Keil ii. p. 351; see further data in *AJPh.* 30. 129) transmits *pietatei*, citing Naevius. Considering the rôle played by Livius' *Odyssey* in elementary education, Scipio Metellus might himself have been taught at school every correct archaism our two epitaphs record. As for the archaic script, so far as it is archaic, I can do no better than to quote from Friedrich's *Catullus* (p. 536), where, speaking of the *Lex Tappula*, he says: "The juristic forms, to be sure, relegate the inscription to the time of the Republic, but that proves nothing. On the Wartburg I have myself bought picture-postcards executed entirely in the tone, style, and orthography of Luther's time (say 1525): even the form of the letters belonged to that time." The slips in archaizing that we shall find in the Scipio epitaphs will be such as one of us might make if, without verifying every word, he tried to write in the precise language of Spenser. No doubt many English specialists could, if they wished, write the language of Chaucer quite impeccably for brief stretches.

5. The motive, the promoter, and the possibility of getting ancestral tombs newly supplied with duly ancient epitaphs¹ have been shown and suggested. Some of the steps in the accomplishment of the task may now be taken up in more detail. In a most instructive essay in *Rev. de Phil.* 14. 113 sq. Woelfflin discussed our two epitaphs, arriving at the conclusion that they were not composed till after the war with Hannibal—that is, a century and a half-century respectively after the *floruit* of the persons commemorated. Accordingly Lindsay, where he touches on these inscriptions in his *Latin Language*, selects 200 B.C. as the last date admissible for them. But Woelfflin did more than to show that, as regards the persons commemorated, the epitaphs were anachronistic. He also pointed out as the model of the epitaph

¹ Going back some thirty years I may record the merry tale of a municipal campaign in which it was brought out, to the great delight of the public, that a certain candidate had got a local

artist to execute an order for a dozen ancestors, appropriately aged and costumed, all painted to resemble the daguerreotype of one actual grandfather.

of the son of Barbatus two lines of the epitaph of Atilius as preserved in the *de Senectute* (§ 61):

- (original) hunc unum plurimae consentiunt gentes
populi primarium fuisse uirum.
(imitation) honc oino ploirume cosentiont r<umore(s)>¹
duonoro optumo fuise uiro.

The Atilian epitaph has come down to us only in Cicero's transcription into the speech of his own time; but, at any rate, in addition to a motive and a promoter of the Scipio epitaphs, we have their model current in the time of Scipio Metellus, their promoter.

6. There is also an objective factor of falsification in one of our epitaphs. I refer to the fact that in the epitaph of Barbatus the space of $1\frac{1}{3}$ lines at the beginning of the field free for the engraver is chipped out so as to show that it was once written upon. Then the six Saturnians of the epitaph are crowded into the remaining space of $3\frac{2}{3}$ lines. What was chipped away? Not an earlier inscription, I think, for it seems most unlikely that an original brief inscription would have been so unevenly distributed as to fill a space so irregular on the field. Also, if an earlier inscription had been there to chip away, one feels that the whole field would have been equally surfaced. What seems most likely is that a blundering stone-chipper started wrong for the Barbatus' epitaph, with a wrong leaf of his 'copy,' and then got to the right epitaph. The confusion was not discovered till later, when the irrelevant $1\frac{1}{3}$ lines were excised. The blunder may have been due to some error of Scipio Metellus himself, as in the inscription on the statue of his great-grandfather. The point is that there is unmistakable evidence of a *retouche* in the Barbatus epitaph. It is perhaps a mere accident of diction that the language of the father's epitaph seems less archaic than that of the son's, though the script form has also seemed later.² If this is so, it is another instance of insufficient care on the part of Scipio Metellus. Possibly the Barbatus' epitaph was put on his tomb by a son or grandson about 200 B.C., while only the archaistic epithet of the son of Barbatus was inspired by Scipio Metellus.

7. Before going on to exhibit the details of archaizing as displayed in the two epitaphs, it will be well to explain the probable procedure of an archaizer. He did not proceed historically, but inversely, having in mind certain formulae as cast for practical purposes, not any more accurate in fact than a current contemporary programme of *Ye Olde Folkes Concert*. Indeed this was the method of Quintilian. In 1. 4. 16-17 he gives (from inscriptions) examples, not of substitution, but of interchange of δ and η , of u and i , and of e and i , including $-ē$ for original $-ai/-ei$. Large collections of such materials must have been available in the schools before the time of Orbilius Pupillus or Verrius Flaccus. If I go on to cite archaistic forms on inscriptions contemporary with

¹ On $r<umores>$ instead of the usual $R<o-
ma(n)i>$ see below.

² Little reliance can be placed on the shape of

P as a criterion for dating. See on the three
P's found in the inscription of the Faliscan
Cooks (p. 163, n. 2).

Scipio M
inscription
With our
Probus in
conuertan
that the '
field of th
script of t
these epit
*schriften*².
the epitaph
son of Ba
the follow
8. (a)
with nomi
we may c
forms of n
9. (b)
passing ov
citing Plau
paene uoci
ignorant o
10. (c)
(ap. Linds
See also N
11. (d)
variants o
fluctuation
late Repub
have *prae*
Lucilius' η /
12. (e)
13. (f)
Scipio Met
double a co
l for ll in N
gemination
14. (g)
No. 218, N
to Lucilius
15. (h)
No. 460 ha
archaistic,
neither to I

Scipio Metellus it should prove that the Scipio epitaphs differ from other inscriptions of late Republican times only by the greater massing of archaisms. With our archaizers' rule of thumb, viz. *oi* archaic for *u* (see §§ 2, 19, 25), cf. Probus in Keil 4. 119. 12: 'item sunt nomina quae *u* litteram et in *oe* litteras conuertant (!), ut puta murorum et moerorum,' etc. Be it always remembered that the 'tituli,' painted in red on the lids of the sarcophagi and not on the field of the epitaphs, may have served roughly as the model for the archaizing script of the epitaphs. For the practical convenience of the reader I am citing these epitaphs and other inscriptions by the numbers of Diehl's *Alllat. Inschriften*². No. 458, the first line of which may be differentiated as a 'titulus,' is the epitaph of Barbatus; No. 459 the 'titulus,' and No. 460 the epitaph of the son of Barbatus. With these texts before him the reader will kindly consider the following notes on the epitaphs.

8. (a) CORNELIVS LVCIVS BARBATVS.—Classical forms, not according with nominative <CORNELI>O of the 'titulus.' For this type of nominative we may compare No. 361, a milestone of 250 B.C. As a source for archaic forms of names milestones were particularly available.

9. (b) GNAIVOD (G not C!): On *ai* for *ae* see below. On 'paragogic' -*d*, passing over Quintilian, I will here cite Charisius ap. Keil 1. 112. 9 where, citing Plautine *ted*, he goes on, '<apud antiquos> mos erat *d* litteram omnibus paene uocibus uocali littera finitis adiungere.' Our archaizer cannot have been ignorant of -*d* in the ablative.

10. (c) QVOIVS: Cf. Varro LL. 8. 50 and *Lex Iulia Municipalis* of 45 B.C. (ap. Lindsay, *Lat. Inscr.* p. 98). Note also *hoiusque* in Diehl, No. 218 (58 B.C.). See also Neue, *Formenlehre*, 2. 450.

11. (d) VIRTVTEI: Cf. on *tempestatei* (§ 4), and in general note the *i/ei* variants on *Lex. Iul. Munic.* and other late Republican inscriptions. The fluctuation of *i* and *ei* in the manuscripts of Plautus likewise goes back to a late Republican archetype. On a legal inscription of 81 B.C. (No. 227. 34) we have *praeconeī darei*. For a long time grammarians continued to discuss Lucilius' *i/ei* rules.

12. (e) QVEI: Cf. *qui/quei* in No. 218.

13. (f) PARISVMA: Rare Plautine form, perhaps modelled on *aequissima*. Scipio Metellus could not have been ignorant of the habit of inscriptions not to double a consonant. Note contemporary inscriptions with *r* for *rr* in No. 218; *l* for *ll* in Nos. 237, 266 (*Metelo, Iuli*<*o*>); while as early as No. 221 (189 B.C.) gemination is quite haphazard.

14. (g) TAVRASIA CISAVNO OMNE: Final *m* omitted, cf. *aede/aedem* in No. 218, No. 330 (44 B.C.). See also Festus, index, s.v. *m finalis*; Marx, index to Lucilius, p. 168.

15. (h) LOVCANAM ABDOVCIT: The word *Lucius* in our epitaph and in No. 460 has *ū* <IE. *eu*, so that *ou* in *Loucanam* and *abdoucit* is certainly archaic, cf. *adiouta* (No. 77) *courauerunt* (No. 210), wherein *ou* can be referred neither to IE. *eu* nor *ou*. As an archaism *ou* was particularly in evidence in the

sacred epithet *Loucina/Lucina* (Juno title) and in the proper names *Fourius* (No. 510) and *Oufens* (No. 225, 90 B.C.; cf. *Oufentina tribus* ap. Festum). That inscriptional *ou* is nothing but an attempt to write *ū*, and even *ū*, archaically seems clear. For the lines of explanation see Lindsay, *LL*. p. 246.

16. I submit that in the epitaph of Barbatus there is no archaism we might not safely attribute to Scipio Metellus himself.

17. EPITAPH OF THE SON OF BARBATVS (No. 460).—The son's epitaph makes a first impression of a far greater antiquity than the father's, and large grammatical dogmata have been extracted from its language, particularly from the form *hec*. Not again to adduce archaisms already accounted for, such as simplification of consonants and the omission of final *m*, the following words call for account.

18. (a) HONC COSENTIONT: Archaizer's rule was 'o for u.' In *Leg.* 3. 7 Cicero wrote *soboles* for *sub-oles*, cf. *Hecoba* in Quintilian 1. 4. 16; *queiquomque* in *Lex Iul. Munic.* The ending *-ont* survived through Festus (*nequinont praedotont*; cf. the inscription examples in Quintilian l.c.). The archaizer's mind works roughly: if *auunculus* (see MSS. spellings in *Thes. LL.* 2. 1607. 60) is for *amunculus*, then *honc* is for *hunc*. Note the hyperarchaism in *erodita* (see Lindsay, *Lat. Inscr.*, p. 96); and the two howlers in *Columna Rostrata Duili*, viz. nominative singular *macistratos* and *exfociont*. Note conversely *huc* for *hoc* (but *comulateis* for *cumulatis*) in No. 218. The omission of *n* in *cosentiont* will follow *cosol* in the superscription; note *cens.* and *ces.* in No. 382 (55 B.C.), also literary spellings like *coiectura*. Quintilian (1. 7. 29) noted the dropping of *n* in *consules*.

19. (b) OI for *oe*, see § 7: Cf. also *oenus* in Plautus *Truc.* 103 and in Cicero's *Laws*; *oenigenos* in Festus. We have in Plautus *Persa* 553 *munitum*, but in the next line *moenitum* (? conditioned on neighbouring *morati*). For omitted *-m* see § 14; and note in No. 292 (time of Cicero) *moiro coiraueront*. See also *foidere* in § 22.

20. (c) DVONORO: *du-* for *b-* was certainly known in Cicero's time (see citations in Lindsay, *LL*. p. 268, where I miss the example *duona* which Horace must have learned out of Livius Andronicus).

21. (d) FILIOS LVCIOM: One need not take up the cudgels in defence of the poetic character of an epitaph promoted by Scipio Metellus, but from a literary aspect (*pace* Buecheler, *CE*. No. 6), Woelfflin's correction of nominative *filios* to *filiom* greatly improves the lines. The engraver's error becomes immediately intelligible if we suppose that he wrongly expanded archaic *filio* as it stood on his 'copy.' For the composer of the 'copy' the form *Cornelio* of the 'titulus' (No. 459) was cue enough for writing *filio*; to the archaizer accusative in *-om* (instead of *-um*) was only a case of *o* for *u* (§ 18); cf. *moiro* already cited.

22. (e) AIDILIS: Cf. *aid.* in No. 296 (time of Cicero), also on *ai/ae* Quintilian 1. 7. 18 sq. (where much ignorance); Festus s.v. *ae syllabam*. On *i* for *e* in diphthongs note *foidere* / *foedere* in *Lex Iul. Munic.*

23.

contemp
the Hou
(167 B.C.)
view of t
cepeit yie
In 62 B.C.
the latte
dedet, cor

24. (

certainly
of *aidiles*
modern -
also on in
as archaic
Quintilian
ingly, it is
genuine th
epitaph.
lighter for
conscienti
I personal
epitaph, i
should be
Nothing c
singular n
quouis/cuin
quod, make
is sound if
Phil. 10. 33
has only h
predominan
(*<oi*) is lik
that *hec* is
'copy,' are

25. (h)

Our archai
archaistic,

¹ On *e* for
man hunting
might extract
ab-emitto amicus
depisci; and, p
² I here rec
the range of p
for *eine*, e.g. in

23. (f) FUET DEDET, but *cepit* (as in No. 458): *-et* and *-it* cannot both be contemporary and genuine: "I mean not to run with the Hare and holde with the Hounde." We find *-et* consistently on *Col. Ros. Duili*, and in No. 283 (167 B.C.) we still find *cepit*; but twenty years earlier (Nos. 281-2) *cepit*. In view of the iambic law, *fueit* and *dedit* should have yielded *fuit* and *dedit* before *cepeit* yielded *cepit*; cf. *dedit* in No. 280 (192 B.C.) and in No. 132 (circa 212). In 62 B.C. the same brief inscription (No. 337) contains *coerauit* but *probaueit*, the latter being anterior to *probaueit*. Surely our intermediate *et* in *fuet* and *dedet*, contrasted with *i* in *cepit*, is also a false archaism.

24. (g) HIC/HEC AIDILIS/ES TEMPESTATEBVS: The *e* of *Tempestatebus* certainly represents original *i* (cf. *nauebos* in *Col. Ros. Duili*), and so does the *e* of *aidiles* (on the 'titulus'). In the verb-forms in the last section we had modern *-it* (<*-eit*) competing with *-et*. That our 'poeta'—depending perhaps also on instances such as those gathered by Lindsay, *LL.* p. 188—regarded *e* as archaic for *i*¹ seems most probable; and that is certainly the implication of Quintilian 1. 4. 17 reporting *Menerua Leber magester Dione Victore*. Accordingly, it is not here admissible to attribute to the *e* of *hec* a character more genuine than the character of the *e*'s representing classical *i*'s elsewhere in the epitaph. The contention that in our inscription *hic* is, in point of emphasis, a lighter form than *hec*, is a pure guess, made of course quite unconsciously and conscientiously, to institute a differentiation, but still a mere guess *ad hoc*. If I personally have any understanding of Latin phrasing I make sure that in our epitaph, independent of disputable metrical considerations, *hic* before *fuet* should be accounted a more emphatic word than the anaphoric *hec* before *cepit*. Nothing could be more sophisticated than Skutsch's derivation of *hec* (nominative singular masculine) from *hō-c(e)*. The parallelism of *hoius/huius huic* with *quouis/cuius cui*, and especially of feminine *haec* (<*ha-ī-ce*) neuter *hoc* with *quod*, makes entirely for *ho-ī-ce* as the original Latin nominative. For *hīc* there is sound if not copious evidence in Plautus (see my review of Skutsch in *Class. Phil.* 10. 338), though *hīc* is commoner. Lucilius (117, 422, 1018, 1022, Marx) has only *hīc*. I attribute *hīc* to *illic istīc*, but proclisis also contributed to the predominance of *hīc*. If in our epitaph *hec* is genuine, then its proclitic *e*² (<*oi*) is like the post-tonic *-e* (<*-ei*) in *fuet*, etc. I voluntarily exclude the plea that *hec* is an engraver's error, though such errors, partly in consequence of bad 'copy,' are not uncommon.³ Liability of E and I to confusion was very great.

25. (h) PLOIRVME: On *oi* as a false archaism for *u* see above (§§ 7, 19). Our archaizer wrote false *plourume* prompted by correct, but here merely archaistic, *oīno*; cf. Cicero's unintelligible *ploera* in *Leg.* 3. 6, again after *oenus*

¹ On *e* for *IE*, *i* see Lindsay *l.c.* p. 194. A man hunting for evidence of archaic spellings might extract from Festus as evidence for *ēi* *ab-emitō amecus acetare demoe (δῆμοι) foreculae indepisci*; and, *per contra*, *i* for *e*: *ioniste lepista*.

² I here record as an astonishing instance of the range of proclisis the German usage of 'ne for *eine*, e.g. in a line of war poetry:

Da oben fliegt 'ne Taube.

The reduction of *hēc* (*hīc*) to *hīc* is like the reduction of Eng. *one* to *a*.

³ Owing to my own defective copy I once had to have a cardplate containing the name Brockenbrough re-engraved—to restore the second *r*.

(3. 9). Festus (p. 258, Lindsay) cites *plera pars* for *maior pars*; is this a reason for assuming *ploera* in the *Laws* as a miswriting of *plera*, say after the group *po-mērium*: *mūrus* (X *moerus*)?

26. The crucial lines of the epitaph (No. 460) are:

HONC OINO PLOIRVME COSENTIONT R<VMORE(S)>
DVONORO OPTVMO FVISE VIRO

I agree with Woelfflin, as against Havet (ap. Buecheler, *CE.* No. 6), that the second of these lines does not record an hereditary title of the Scipios, a notion entirely incompatible with the context of Livy 29. 14. 8, 'P. Scipionem . . . adolescentem nondum quaestorium, iudicauerunt in tota ciuitate uirum bonum (so the MSS.; the form is genitive plural) optimum esse.' I rather agree with Duruy's interpretation of the facts (*History of Rome*, i. p. 638, Boston edition), viz. that this young Scipio was selected expressly for his individual religious character, or to preclude the jealousy of weightier claimants for the honour. Livy explicitly disavows knowing the reasons why the choice was made, and somewhat mysteriously refuses to express his own conjectures on the subject. I take it that the words *uirum bonum optimum esse* came to Livy and to the composer of our epitaph from the same source, a family or other tradition or record concerning the young Publius. To our poet they furnished the cue for his variation of the line in the Atilian epitaph,

POPVLI PRIMARIVM FVISE VIRVM.

The first of our pair of lines I would render as follows:

HVNC VNVM PLVRVMI CONSENTIVNT R<VMORE(S)>.

The Latinity of *cosentiont rumore(s)* is perfectly good; cf. examples from Cicero in *Thes. LL.* 4. 401 sq., 'c. mentes atque sententiae,' 'consilia c.' etc. As regards final *e* for *ei* in *ploirume*, a model was always to hand in the official titles with *aere flando* and *iure dicundo*. See also § 23. The usage of *rumor* *rumores* with and for *fama* (cf. *cosentiont r.* with *consentiens fama* in Cicero) can be verified in the lexicæ. Perhaps we should read here *rumore* in the sense of *rumore secundo* (see examples in Lewis and Short and cf. Kiessling's note on Horace, *Epist.* 1. 10. 9); cf. *rumor populi* (in bad sense) in Terence, *Ph.* 911, and *secundo populi rumore* in Fenestella, as cited by Nonius (p. 615, L.), who defines *rumor* by 'fauor' 'auxiliatio,' citing Ennius, *Ann.* 261, 'legio rediit rumore.' Here I would interpret *rumore* by *plausu populari*, cf. (in O.O.) 'rumorem quendam et plausum popularem esse quaesitum,' Cicero, *Clu.* 131.

27. CONSOL: I note that the orthography of this title is not a reliable criterion for dating, though recently used as such (see *Class. Phil.* 14. 81). The restoration of *n* is clearly an act of recomposition, and as such absolutely dateless. Lindsay, *LL.* p. 192, expressly cites *consolibus* as of 71 B.C., and Velius Longus (ap. *Thes. LL.* 4. 562. 27) states that *consol* was the written form of *consul*.

28.
ing state
other pe
vital and
They wr
will have
extant in
was a d
phonetic
Lucilius
tragedian
with gran
means w
church—

UNIVER

[The
of the aut
one of the

28. May I recur in conclusion to the well-known fact that at Rome ranking statesmen and men of letters were, in a higher degree than among any other people known to us, keenly interested in things grammatical, as in a vital and fruitful science? Livius was a Greek, Ennius a hyphenate Greek. They wrote and taught Latin. Comparative Grammar of Latin and Greek will have begun with them. Not altogether feeble essays in this science are extant in Varro (cf. e.g. *LL.* 6. 96). The highly-paid Professor of Oscan (§ 4) was a dialectologist. A Messala (born 59 B.C.), however inexpert as a phonetician, wrote a book on the letter S. A century before him, the poet Lucilius had hitched the orthography into verse, in opposition to Accius the tragedian, who had championed spelling reform. Caesar did more than dabble with grammar. Horace was drilled on the *glossae* of Livius. Every necessary means was to hand for Scipio Metellus—as for the Bishop of St. Praxed's church—to order Livian or Naevian epitaphs for his ancestors.

†EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

[The manuscript of this article reached us simultaneously with the news of the death of the author, which took place on February 17th last. The *Classical Quarterly* loses one of the earliest and most original-minded of its contributors.—EDD. C.Q.]

THE EARLIEST VISIBLE PHASE OF THE MOON.

I AM glad that Dr. Fotheringham in the interesting paper which appeared in the *Classical Quarterly* (April, 1920, pp. 97-8) adhered to the view that 'Caesar calculated the new moon for January 1 [45 B.C.] . . . and that this calculation determined the inaugural day of the Julian calendar.' As the object of my brief note, on which he commented, was merely to show that Groebe had failed to prove that the day in question was January 2, I have only a few questions to ask. But first, in justice to Judeich, I ought to say that his calculations, which Dr. Fotheringham notices, were made with the help of the assistant-astronomer attached to the observatory of the University of Strassburg.¹ While Dr. Fotheringham admits that I was right in maintaining that the new moon of January 2, 45 B.C. (1.26 a.m.) was not visible on the evening of that day, he holds that Groebe was 'fairly entitled to say' that the new moon of March 24, 58 B.C. (4.40 p.m.), was visible on March 25. Dr. Fotheringham may be justified in saying that it ought 'in normal [or abnormally fine?] weather to have been visible that evening'; but, as I observed in my note, Groebe affirmed that in calculating the time of visibility of the crescent we should accept the mean of the Babylonian estimates, 36 hours—less, I should have added, in the early spring and the winter, more in the summer and autumn. Was he entitled to deduct 9 hours from the mean for an observation made not in the clear atmosphere of the East, but in Switzerland? Dr. Fotheringham tells us that 'the shortest interval between a new moon and the observation of the moon by Schmidt's naked eye comes' not, as Groebe said, to 29, but 'to 25.7 hours.' But forty-eight of Schmidt's forty-nine observations were made at Athens, where the atmosphere is clearer than in Switzerland. The great difference in visibility which a clear atmosphere makes must strike everyone who goes from this country or from Switzerland to the East or to Northern Africa. I realized it for the first time when I was exploring in Tunisia before the war. Has Dr. Fotheringham or any other trustworthy observer ever seen with the naked eye in an atmosphere no clearer than that of Geneva a moon not more than 27 hours old? If so, is it not remarkable that, as Dr. Fotheringham has said,² 'Hitherto it has been the practice to assume that [in the early spring or the winter and in favourable weather?] the moon becomes visible on the first evening when she is more than 30 hours old at sunset'?

I have asked these questions because Dr. Fotheringham, in the article contributed to the *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, to which he referred in his comments, remarked that some important dates had been made to depend upon the old practice, and expressed the hope that his paper would make it possible to fix them on a surer foundation. Perhaps, if he thinks that my questions deserve to be considered, he may make the foundation surer still.

T. RICE HOLMES.

¹ In attributing to Judeich the view that 'the earliest moment of visibility is about 33 hours after new moon' I relied upon his statement (*Caesar in Orient*, p. 107, note) that a new moon of February 28 (4.51 a.m.) was not visible on March 2 except in a very clear atmosphere and to extraordinarily keen observation, combined

with his statement (p. 108) that the new moon of March 23, 47 B.C. (7.49 a.m.), was visible about 5 p.m. on March 24—an appearance which he evidently considered remarkably early.

² *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 1910, p. 531.

THE A

As i
preserved
Nos. 103
writing
beginning
later in
archetype
P.V., Lo
worthy, f
the scrib
as often
unimport
is assimil
the other
nearly al
is perhap
corruption
agreement
(2) in two
all of wh
'Peruigi
and 79 ha
substanti
been suc
of these p
(probably
ST 'priu
T 'unica
ST 'Rom
phrase be

The
which th
copied ag
archetype

THE *PERVIGILIVM VENERIS* AND THE TIBERIANI *AMNIS* IN QUATRAINS.

THE *PERVIGILIVM VENERIS*.

As is well known, this poem, which stood in the *Anthologia Latina*, is preserved in two MSS. only, the Salmasian (or *S*) and the Pithoean (or *T*), Nos. 10318 and 8071 in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; 'the handwriting dates' the former 'as written at the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century; the other . . . is about two hundred years later in date. Modern scholars regard both MSS. as traceable to a common archetype, probably of the sixth century' (Professor Mackail in Catullus and *P.V.*, Loeb Classical Library). At first sight these MSS. seem quite untrustworthy, for they differ from each other in more than one hundred words, while the scribe of *S* copied the refrain incorrectly twice, the scribe of *T* twice as often. Strangely enough, however, these variations are comparatively unimportant, for most of them disappear when the spelling of the two clerks is assimilated to some recognized usage. Each manuscript in turn corrects the other in many of these passages, and conjecture has successfully emended nearly all of the remainder—the variation *S perucilanda*, *T pervigila* in v. 47 is perhaps the only passage of this kind which still causes anxiety. The grave corruptions of the text are found in passages in which the MSS. are in agreement; they agree exactly (1) in five lacunae, *T* having an additional one; (2) in two or more misplaced passages; (3) in the placing of the refrain, with all of which matters I deal below; they agree exactly in an error in the title 'Peruigilium' for 'Pervigilium,' and in about twelve lines, of which vv. 51 and 79 have almost certainly been preserved in an incorrect form. They agree substantially in a certain number of meaningless phrases, of which some have been successfully corrected, others perhaps still await correction, the chief of these phrases being *S* 'gaza' *T* 'gazas' for 'casas' v. 6, *ST* 'et' 'in' for (probably) 'en' 'en' vv. 14, 16, *S* 'micanat' *T* 'mecanat' for 'micant' v. 14, *ST* 'prius' for some word meaning 'of Venus' v. 23, *S* 'unica marita noto' *T* 'unica marito nodo' v. 26, *S* 'detinente (*T* "detinentet") canticis' v. 47, *ST* 'Romoli matrem' v. 79, *ST* 'explicat aonii' for 'explicant tauri' v. 85, the phrase being a quotation from Calpurnius Siculus, *Ec.* I. 4 and 5.

The chief problems in the text have always arisen from these passages, in which the MSS. support each other; they have apparently been faithfully copied again and again, but were already corrupt at the time when the archetype was written.

The version of the poem, which is printed below, has been drawn up on the hypotheses—(i.) that though the text of the MSS. must be emended in details, it yet exhibits the lines which it has preserved nearly in their original order; (ii.) that when the lacunae in the MS. text (five in *S*, six in *T*) are filled, the poem breaks up naturally, as Professor Mackail has so long maintained, into quatrains or stanzas of four lines each; (iii.) that some of the difficulties of the text are due to the fact that certain passages were altered by an editor who scanned his verses accentually.

As for the first point, though my text does not, I think, depend unduly on emendations, yet apart from the lines which form the refrain it displaces only two passages from their MS. positions, viz. the line 'Et recentibus uirentes,' etc. (v. 40), which nearly all editors place where I have placed it, and the sentence 'Tunc cruore . . . imbribus' (vv. 63 to 66), which with Riese I have attached to the stanza 'Cras erit . . . corpore' (vv. 59 to 62). My view is that these two stanzas originally told in full the story of Uranus, which is as follows: A cloudy sky hung over a lifeless earth till Uranus' marriage with Gaea; then the seasonal changes first began, and Oceanus, Hyperion, Cronos, with other children (the Titans) were born to the pair; finally Cronos rose against his father, he unmanned him with his scythe and from the member cut off, which fell into the sea together with blood and foam, Venus came into existence. The passage was, I believe, purposely mutilated and transposed in order to disguise this unmonastic legend: two passages in which Dione was mentioned were brought together when it was so transposed, while 'ipsa' of v. 68 has again a clear meaning when the lines are placed as I have placed them.

As for the lacunae, most of them are revealed by discontinuities in the thought of the composition; one line only (v. 7) has been added in my version from metrical considerations. The whole poem, apart from the refrain, consisted, if this reconstruction is correct, of eighty-eight lines, there being a stop at the end of every fourth line.

The question of the MS. lines (six in all) which can only be scanned accentually is a more difficult matter, for neither in Greek nor in Latin were the rules of scansion for trochaic tetrameter catalectic verses as definite as the rules for hexameter and elegiac poetry. Euripides, however, observed the following scheme of scansion as normal—

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c} - & \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup \\ \hline \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & - & \cup & - \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \end{array},$$

admitting also tribrachs freely to replace trochees, and anapaests occasionally to replace spondees, but he did not place a spondee nor an anapaest in the first, third, fifth, or seventh foot. In 349 of his lines I have found only two variations from this scheme, viz. in *Iph. A.* 882 and *Or.* 1535, where dactyls occur in the second and third feet; but both lines contain proper names. Auct. *P.V.* did not observe exactly the same scheme of scansion as

Euripides
to have
emended
theory h
which h
century a
not deal
those wh
especially
adsederu
ipsa iura
chances
a consist
corrector
is quite a
our emen
in the ca
Foebus'
judgment
'aleret m
fifth foot.
grave sus
is read i
should b
readings-
'pueri' a
accentual
Most edit
Mr. Rack

With
seems to
the versio
and ende
i.e. not a
early dat
chorally,
my text;
this versio
have trac

The
first line
it seems
and be us
highly ela

Euripides, but he observed a very similar one, and in particular he seems to have observed the same rule as to the placing of spondees—if 'uernis' is emended to 'ueris' in v. 60, he observed it absolutely. According to my theory however an 'accentual editor' corrected certain passages, viz. some which had become corrupted and some which contained elisions, for sixth-century accentual verse normally left the first of two vowels unelided: he did not deal with the whole of the poem, but with selected passages only, viz. those which he could correct without special difficulty, and I trace his hand especially in v. 51. This stands in both MSS. as 'Praesens ipsa iura dicit, adsederunt Gratiae,' which Douza wrote and all later editors write as 'Praeses ipsa iura dicet, adsidebunt Gratiae.' It is impossible under any doctrine of chances that a passage of six words should contain three errors and yet show a consistent meaning unless it has at some time been corrected, and the corrector in this case scanned his line accentually. As however this MS. line is quite an intelligible one, we cannot consistently emend it without carrying our emendations further: nearly all recent editors have acted on this principle in the cases of 'uernis' in v. 60, 'fiam (or "faciam") ut' in v. 95, and 'me Foebus' in v. 96; there remain two accentual readings, which must in my judgment stand or fall together; they are 'pueri mater alitis' in v. 56, and 'aleret magno corpore' in v. 62, each of which contains an anapaest in the fifth foot. The author's placing of spondees in the rest of the poem throws grave suspicion upon both passages, but the critical fact is the word that is read in v. 47; if 'peruigilanda' is to be read there, 'pueri' and 'aleret' should both be retained; if however 'peruiglanda' is read, and the MS. readings—S 'peruiclanda' T 'peruigila'—in my judgment support this form, 'pueri' and 'aleret' should both be emended. I believe them to be in fact accentual readings, the anapaest in each case being pronounced as a tribrach. Most editors write 'mater alitis dei' in v. 56; I have adopted a conjecture of Mr. Rackham's 'magno alebat corpore' in v. 62.

With regard to the refrain, though the data are scanty and obscure, there seems to me enough evidence to establish as probable the following history for the version of it which we find in the MSS. Though the original poem began and ended with the line 'Cras amet,' etc., it did not contain any refrain at all, i.e. not any recurring line which stood between quatrains; later, though at an early date, a refrain was added, intended for use when the poem was sung chorally, and it was of the form or nearly of the form which I have shown in my text; the version of the refrain, which we find in the MSS., arose from this version by the processes of corruption and occasional emendation which I have traced in the text of the quatrains.

The evidence for the first of these hypotheses is to be found chiefly in the first line of the poem, where 'Cras amet,' etc., stands as a line of a quatrain, it seems to me impossible that a line should both be placed in that position and be used as a refrain between quatrains in the original draft of a poem as highly elaborated as the *Peruigilium* is. Further evidence is to be found in the

last stanza of the piece, viz. in the line 'Sic Amyclas,' etc. (v. 97); that line can be removed without any injury to the poem, and it is the only line in the whole composition from which a quadrisyllable at the end is not excluded—I say 'excluded' because endings of that sort can be kept out of trochaic catalectic verses only with difficulty, as anyone can prove by writing ten lines in this metre or by examining the earlier verses of Florus (Nos. 291-298 in the *Oxford Book of Latin Verse*). This line was, I suggest, inserted in the last stanza when the line 'Cras amet,' etc., was detached from it to serve as part of the refrain. I find also further evidence in the general structure of the poem, which shows three well-marked divisions of six, seven, and nine stanzas respectively. I do not think that a poem intended to carry a refrain at the end of every second stanza could have been composed in that form, while the MS. version can hardly have been derived from a scheme in which the refrain was repeated after every stanza. I obtain my version of the refrain from that of the MSS. by making four changes in the latter: (1) I have transposed with the passage 'Tunc cruore . . . imbribus' (vv. 63-67) the refrain attached to that passage in the MSS., (2) I have assumed a lacuna of a refrain as well as of a line of a quatrain at the end of the fourth stanza, (3) I have struck out the refrain which in the MS. version bisects the seventeenth quatrain, and (4) I have for symmetry of arrangement moved the refrain which the MSS. place at the end of the nineteenth stanza to the end of the twentieth. Thus I obtain a scheme in which there were normally two stanzas between the repetitions of the refrain, but in which intervals of three stanzas were admitted twice in order that the refrain might fit not only the whole piece of twenty-two quatrains, but the parts of it which consisted of six, seven, and nine quatrains respectively. The MS. version appears to me to have arisen from this scheme by simple corruption in the first two of the passages which I have mentioned, and by editorship in the last two of them, the editor having placed refrains in two cases to mark apparent breaks in the thought of the composition after the division of it into quatrains had been forgotten. The whole scheme of the refrain must be assigned to that comparatively late period if the whole of it is considered to be of the same date and the line 'Cras amet,' etc., is retained in the middle of the seventeenth stanza.

In my text I have printed in italics all passages inserted to fill lacunae—Professor Mackail kindly allows me to print the seventh line from his text in the Loeb Classical Library, the other lines in italics are my own interpretations of the missing verses—and I have marked with asterisks those conjectures which I have not found in other texts. I have also enclosed in brackets the refrain and v. 97—these lines stand in parenthesis, and they may be additions made by a 'Kapellmeister' to the original composition. The lines of my reconstruction are numbered in the left-hand margin, the numbers in the right-hand margin are the numbers of the lines in the MS. text. The number used in any reference to a line is the number of that line in my own version.

My
structions
counsel:
collation
(publishe
old emen
Christ's
continual
examined

- 1 Cras a
qui
- 2 Ver n
uer
- 3 Vere
nul
- 4 Et ne
ma

- 5 Cras
um
- 6 Implic
my
- 7 Cras c
cho
- 8 Cras I
thr
- 9 (Cras

- 1 amauit
- 3 amatore
- 5 amorem.

My work depends throughout on Professor Mackail's important reconstructions of this poem, and I owe him also many thanks for much considerate counsel; my work was made possible in its details only by the facsimiles and collation of the MSS. contained in Mr. C. Clementi's *Pervigilium Veneris* (published by Messrs. Blackwell), and I owe to him also my knowledge of the old emendation of v. 79. I am deeply indebted to Mr. H. Rackham, of Christ's College, Cambridge, not only for two emendations, but also for continual encouragement and restraint, while Mr. W. H. Porter has also examined and criticized my work most helpfully.

THE 'PERVIGILIVM VENERIS' IN
QUATRAINS.

I.

- 1 Cras amet qui numquam amavit, [1
 quique amavit cras amet,
2 Ver nouum, uer iam canorum, [2
 uere natus orbis est,
3 Vere concordant amores, uere [3
 nubunt alites,
4 Et nemus comam resoluit de [4
 maritis imbribus.

2.

- 5 Cras amorum copulatrix inter [5
 umbras arborum
6 Implicat casas uirentes de flagello [6
 myrteo;
7 *Cras canoris feriatos ducit in siluis*
 choros,
8 Cras Dione iura dicit fulta sublimi [7
 throno.
9 (Cras amet, etc.) [8

THE 'PERVIGILIVM VENERIS' IN THE
TEXT OF 'S' AS EXHIBITED IN THE
FACSIMILE OF THE MS. PUBLISHED
BY MR. CLEMENTI; THE VARIATIONS
IN THE TEXT OF 'T' ARE SHOWN IN
NOTES AT THE FOOT OF THE PAGE.
STOPS ARE ABSENT FROM BOTH MSS.;
THE WORDS ARE SELDOM SEPARATED
IN 'S.'

- 1 Cras amet qui numquam amabit qui-
 que amavit cras amet;
2 Ver nouum uer iam canorum uere
 natus Iouis est
3 Vere concordant amores uere nubunt
 alites
4 Et nemus comam resoluit de maritis
 imbribus.
5 Cras amorum copulatrix inter umbras
 arborum
6 Implicat gaza uirentis de flagello
 mirteo
7 Cras Dione iura dicit fultas sublime
 trono,
8 Cras amet qui numquam amavit qui-
 que amavit cras amet.
9 Tunc cruore de superbo
 spumeo pontus globo
10 Cerulas inter cateruas inter et bi-
 pedes equos
11 Fecit undantem Dionem de maritis
 imbribus.
12 Cras amet qui numquam amavit qui-
 que amavit cras amet.

1 amavit quique cras amavit. 2 uer; orbis.
3 amatores; nubent. 4 comam, resoluet.
5 amorem. 6 gazas uirentes; myrteo. 7 fulta

sublimi. 8 quinque. 9 Tuno quiuore de super-
huc spumeo pont' de gloou. 10 cerulas; ui-
pedes. 11 Dione.

3.

- 10 Ipsa gemmis purpurantem pingit annum floridis, [13] 13 Ipsa gemmis purpurantem pingit annum floribus,
 11 Ipsa turgentes papillas de Fauoni spiritu [14] 14 Ipsa surgentes papillas de Faboni spiritu
 12 Vrget in nodos tepentes, ipsa roris lucidi, [15] 15 Vrget in notos penates ipsas roris lucidi
 13 Noctis aura quem relinquit, [16] 16 Noctis aura quem relinquit spargit tumentis aquas.

4.

- 14 En micant lacrimae trementes de caduco pondere, [17] 17 Et micanat lacrimas trementes de caduco pondere
 15 Gutta praeceps orbe paruo sustinet casus suos; [18] 18 Gutta praeceps urbe paruo sustine casus suos;
 16 En pudorem florulentae prodiderunt purpurae; [19] 19 In pudore florulente prodiderunt purpore
 17 *Enitent rosae rubore casta pulchrae pectora,*
 18 (*Cras amet, etc.*)

5.

- 19 Vmor ille, quem serenis astra rorant noctibus, [20] 20 Humor ille quem serenis astra rorant noctibus
 20 Mane uirgines papillas soluit umentis peplo, [21] 21 Mane uirgineas papillas soluit tumenti peplo,
 21 *Mane flauum ui Dione castitatem uindicat;*
 22 Ipsa iussit mane totae uirgines nubant rosae. [22] 22 Ipsa iussit manet tute uirgines nubant rosae.

6.

- 23 Facta de *ipsius cruore deque Amoris oculis [23] 23 Facta prius de cruore deque Amoris oculis
 24 Deque gemmis deque flammis deque solis purpuris, [24] 24 Deque gemmis deque flammis deque solis purporis
 25 Cras ruborem, qui latebat ueste tectus ignea, [25] 25 Cras ruborem qui latebat ueste tectus ignea
 26 Vuido marita nodo non pudebit soluere. [26] 26 Vnica marita noto non pudebit soluere.
 27 (*Cras amet, etc.*) [27] 27 Cras amet qui numquam amauit quique amauit cras amet.

7.

- 28 Ipsa nymphas diua luco iussit ire myrteo; [28] 28 Ipsa nimfas diua luco iussit ire myrteo
 29 It puer comes puellis; nec tamen credi potest [29] 29 Et puer comes puellis, nec tamen credi potest
 30 Esse amorem feriatum si sagittas uexerit; [30] 30 Esse Amorem feriatum si sagittas uexerit;
 31 Ite, nymphae, posuit arma, feriatum est Amor. [31] 31 In te nimfe, posuit arma, feriatum est Amor.

13 gemmas. 14 spauritu, corrected to spauritu (Clementi). 15 totos pentes ipsa. 16 relinquit. 17 mecanat lacrimae; cadum. 18 praeceps; orbe; sustinet. 19 pudorem; pupure.

20 Umor. 21 papilla; solui. 22 ip; mane tuae. 23 fusta; deque; oculis. 24 pupuris. 26 marito nodo; pudens. 28 loco. 29 comis. 31 ite nymfe.

32 Iussus
iuss
33 Neu q
qui
34 Sed ta
quod
35 Totus
nud
36 (Cras a
37 Conpar
te u
38 'Vna
ced
39 Vt ne
feri
40 Et re
um

41 'Ipsa u
flec
42 Ipsa u
uirg
43 Iam tri
noc
44 Congre
salt

45 'Flores
inte
46 Nec C
nec
47 *Detin
glan
48 Regnet
Del
49 (Cras a

50 'Iussit
diu
51 Praese
bur
52 Hybla
qui
53 Hybla
tus

32 est; d
pulcher. 3
re. 39 incr
line omitt

8.

- 32 Iussus est inermis ire, nudus ire [32 32 Iussus e inermis ire, nudos ire iussus
iussus est,
33 Neu quid arcu neu sagitta neu [33 33 Neu quid arcu neu sagitta neu quid
quid igne laederet;
34 Sed tamen, nymphae, cauete, [34 34 Sed tamen nimfe cauete quod Cupido
quod Cupido pulcher est;
35 Totus est inermis idem quando [35 35 Totus est inermis sidem quando nudus
nudus est Amor.
36 (Cras amet, etc.). [36 36 Cras amet qui numquam amauit qui-
que amauit cras amit.

9.

- 37 Conpari Venus pudore mittit ad [37 37 Conpari Venus pudore mittit ad te
te uirgines;
38 'Vna res est quam rogamus, [38 38 'Vnam res est quam rogamus, cede,
cede, uirgo Delia,
39 Vt nemus sit incruentum de [39 39 Vt nemus sit incruentum de ferinis
ferinis stragibus
40 Et recentibus uirentes ducat [58 40 Et recentibus uirentes ducat
umbras floribus.

10.

- 41 'Ipsa uellet te rogare, si pudicam [40 40 'Ipsa uellit erogare, si pudicam flec-
flecteret,
42 Ipsa uellet ut uenires, si deceret [41 41 Ipsa uellit ut uenires, si deceret
uirginem;
43 Iam tribus choros uideres feriatos [42 42 Iam tribus choros uideres feriatos
noctibus
44 Congreges inter cateruas ire per [43 43 Congreges inter cateruas ire per saltus
saltus tuos.

11.

- 45 'Floreas inter coronas, myrteas [44 44 'Floreas inter coronas, myrteo inter
inter casas
46 Nec Ceres nec Bacchus absunt [45 45 Nec Ceres nec Baccus absunt nec
nec poetarum deus;
47 *Detinente tota nox est perui- [46 46 Detinente tota nox est peruiclanda
glanda *canticis;
48 Regnet in siluis Dione, tu recede, [47 47 Regnet in siluis Dione, tu recede,
Delia.
49 (Cras amet, etc.). [48 48 Cras amet qui numquam amauit qui-
que amauit cras amet.

12.

- 50 'Iussit Hyblaeis tribunal stare [49 49 'Iussit Hyblei tribunal stare diua
diua floribus,
51 Praeses ipsa iura dicet, adside- [50 50 Presens ipsa iura dicit, adsederunt
bunt Gratiae;
52 Hybla totos funde flores, quid- [51 51 Hibla totus fundet * * quidquid
quid annus adtulit,
53 Hybla florum sume uestem quan- [52 52 Hibla florum superestem quantus
tus Aetnae campus est. Et nec campus est;

32 est; durus. 33 acuneo; digne. 34 nymfe;
pulcher. 35 idem. 36 qui; amet. 38 una
re. 39 incruendum; stragibus. 40 The whole
line omitted. 41 uellet; diceret. 42 choros.

44 mysteas. 45 Baccas; poetarum; deas. 46 de-
tinent et; peruigila. 49 Ybleis. 51 totos funde
flores quidquid annis adtulit. 52 rumpereste;
Ethne.

13.

- 54 'Ruris hic erunt puellae uel [53 53 'Ruris hic erunt puellae uel puellae
puellae montium
55 Quaeque siluas quaeque lucos [54 54 Quaeque siluas quae locus queque
quaeque fontes incolunt;
56 Iussit omnes adsidere mater alitis [55 55 Iussit omnes adsidere pueri mater
dei,
57 Iussit et nudo puellas nil Amori [56 56 Iussit et nudo puellas nil Amori
credere.'
58 (Cras amet, etc.). [57 57 Cras amet qui numquam amauit qui-
que amauit cras amet.
58 Et rigentibus uirentes duoad umbra
floribus.

14.

- 59 Cras erit cum primus Aether [59 59 Cras erit quo primus Ether copolauit
copolauit nuptias;
60 Vt Pater *totis creauit ueris [60 60 Vt Pater totis creauit uernis annum
annum nubibus,
61 In sinum maritus imber fluxit [61 61 In sinum maritus imber fluxit alme
almae coniugis;
62 Vnde fetus mixtus omnes magno [62 62 Vnde flaetus mixtus omnis alteret
*alebat corpore.

15.

- 63 Tunc cruore de superno *caelitis-* [9
que saucia
64 *Turbidus de pube* pontus spumeoque [9
de globo
65 Caerulas inter cateruas inter et [10
bipedes equos
66 Fecit undantem Dionen de mari- [11
tis imbribus.
67 (Cras amet, etc.). [12

16.

- 68 Ipsa uenas atque mentem per- [63 63 Ipsa uenas adque mentem permeanti
meanti spiritu
69 Intus occultis gubernat procrea- [64 64 Intus occultis gubernat procreatis uiri-
trix uiribus,
70 Perque caelum perque terras [65 65 Per quem caelum per quem terras
perque pontum subditum
71 *Pergit omne corpus ugens, omne com-*
plens numine.

17.

- 72 Peruium sui tenorem seminali [66 66 Peruium sui tenderem seminali tra-
tramite
73 Inbuit iussitque mundum nosse [67 67 Inbuit iussitque mundum nosse nas-
nascendi uias;
68 Cras amet qui numquam amauit qui-
que amauit cras amet.

53 et (?). 54 que locos. 55 alitas. 56 nullo.
58 uergentes ducat umbras. 59 qui; Aether
copolauit. 60 crearet. 61 fluctus alma et.

62 ut fletus; aleret. 63 uernas atque; per-
meante spū. 64 gubernat procreatrix. 65 per-
que; perque. 66 tenorem. 67 nosce.

74 Ipsa T
tran
75 Ipsa I
iug

76 Moxqu
pu
77 Romul
nup

78 Vnde I
pro
79 *Romu
tem

80 (Cras a

81 Rura
Ven
82 Ipse A
nat
83 Hunc
sus
84 Ipsa fl
osc

85 Ecce ia
can
86 Quisqu
iug
87 Subter
bala
88 Et can
alite
89 (Cras a

90 Iam lo
cyg
91 Adsona
uml
92 Vt put
mus
93 Et neg
bar

69 nec p
Saumis. 73
78 perturir
82 tuus; c

THE PERVIGILIVM VENERIS AND THE TIBERIANI AMNIS 181

- 69 Ipsa Troianos nepotes in Latinos transtulit,
69 Ipsa Troianos nepotes in Latinos transtulit,
70 Ipsa Laurentem puellam coniugem nato dedit;
70 Ipsa Laurentem puellam coniugem nato dedit;

18.

- 71 Moxque Marti de sacello dat pudicam uirginem,
71 Moxque Marti de sacello dat pudicam uirginem,
72 Romuleas ipsas fecit cum Sabinis nuptias,
72 Romuleas ipsas fecit cum Sabinis nuptias,
73 Vnde Samnes et Quirites proque prole posterum
73 Vnde Samnes et Quirites proque prole posterum
74 Romoli matrem crearet et nepotem Caesarem.
74 Romoli matrem crearet et nepotem Caesarem.
75 Cras amet qui numquam amauit quique amauit cras amet.

19.

- 76 Rura fecundat uoluptas, rura Venerem sentiunt;
76 Rura fecundat uoluptas, rura Venerem sentiunt;
77 Ipse Amor, puer Dionae, rure natus dicitur;
77 Ipse Amor, puer Dionae, rure natus dicitur;
78 Hunc ager cum parturiret, ipsa suscepit sinu,
78 Hunc ager cum parturiret ipsa suscepit sinum,
79 Ipsa florum delicatis educauit osculis.
79 Ipsa florum deligatis educauit osculis.
80 Cras amet qui numquam amauit quique amauit cras amet.

20.

- 81 Ecce iam super genestas explicat aonii latus,
81 Ecce iam super genestas explicat aonii latus,
82 Quisque tutus quo tenetur coniugali foedere;
82 Quisque tutus quo tenetur coniugali foedere;
83 Subter umbras cum maritis ecce balantum greges,
83 Subter umbras cum maritis ecce balantum gregis,
84 Et canoras non tacere diua iussit alites.
84 Et canoras non tacere diua iussit alites.
80 Cras amet, etc.).

21.

- 85 Iam loquaces ore rauco stagna cygni perstrepunt;
85 Iam loquaces ore rauco stangna quinni perstrepunt;
86 Adsonat Terei puella subter umbram populi,
86 Adsonat Terei puella subter umbram populi,
87 Vt putes motus amoris ore dici musico
87 Vt putes motus amoris ore dici musico
88 Et neges queris sororem de marito barbaro.
88 Et neges queris sororem de marito barbaro.

69 nec potes; Latino. 72 Romuleas ipsa; gregum. 84 canores. 85 stagna cigni. 86 adsonante aerei puellae supter umbram populi. 73 Rames. 76 facundat. 77 natus. 78 perturiret; sinu. 79 delicatis. 80 amat. 87 putas; musico. 88 eet; queri. 82 tuus; cum iugali; federe. 83 ualantum

22.

- 94 Illa cantat, nos tacemus; quando [89 89 Illa cantat, nos tacemus; quan uir
uer uenit meum?
95 Quando *uer *uenit, chelidon, [90 90 Quando fiam ut caelidon ut tacere
ut tacere desinam?
96 Perdidit musam tacendo, nec me [91 91 Perdidit musam tacendo, nec me
Apollo respicit;
97 (Sic Amyclas, cum tacerent, [92 92 Sic Amiclas, cum taceret, perdidit
perdidit silentium.)
98 Cras amet qui numquam amauit [93 93 Cras amet qui numquam amauit qui-
quique amauit cras amet.

89 quando uer. 90 faciam; celidon; taceret. 91 perdidimus antacendonem. 92 Amidas; perdidit.

NOTES.

S = the Salmasian MS., Parisii 10318; T = the Pithoean MS., Parisii 8071.

v. 16 is, I think, directly quoted from Florus ('de rosa'), 'Necdum uirgineus pudor exsinuatur amictu,' a line which is quoted also by Ausonius (*Id.* 14, 29) and in *Lat. Anth.*, No. 1020.

v. 18. A repetition of the refrain, though it does not appear in the MSS., seems certainly due here; it may have disappeared from the text as the previous line has done, or it may even have been transposed to the seventeenth stanza, where the MSS. place the refrain between vv. 73 and 74 of my text.

v. 23. *de ipsius*, *ST* prius *de*. The meaning is certainly 'of Venus,' and Buecheler's emendation 'Cypridis' has been adopted by most editors. An anapaest however in this position must be almost unparalleled, and the MS. reading seems to me clearly to represent an original 'ipsius,' Venus being 'ipsa' in the previous line; if this is correct, the author wrote 'facta de ipsius,' and the accentual editor is responsible for 'facta (unelided) ipsius de.' Cf. the change of 'me Foebus' to 'me Apollo' in v. 96.

The line is adapted from and explained by Florus ('de rosis'):

'Aut hoc risit Amor aut hoc de pectine traxit
Purpureis Aurora comis; aut sentibus haesit
Cypris et hic spinis insedit sanguis acutis.'

v. 25. *igneae*, 'igneum' has been suggested, but 'igneus' would be needed and 'igneae' seems right. I take 'ueste ignea' to mean 'the bud showing colour,' 'ruborem' 'the full colour of the open rose.'

v. 40. *Et recentibus*, etc. *ST* place this line as v. 58, i.e. immediately before the line 'Cras erit quum,' etc.: it was, as Mr. Clementi points out, omitted by error and entered, when the error was discovered, at the end of the second part of the poem, no doubt with a mark of identification, which was afterwards lost. Nearly all editors place it in this position.

v. 47. *detinente*, *S* *detinente*, *T* *detinentet* (where *t*- follows); *peruiglanda*, *S* *peruiclanda*, *T* *peruigila*. I believe that *S* has preserved this line correctly except in the tail of the *g*, and in the last syllable of the verse. I supply 'noctem' after 'detinente,' comparing for the meaning of the latter word Ovid, *Ep. ex Ponto* 4; 10, 67, 'detinui tempus' 'I made the time pass,' and for the form of the expression Tiberianus' line (of a bird caught in a shower) 'Capta est pondere depremente plumae.'

v. 53. *Aetnae*, *S* *Etnae* (where *c*- follows), *T* *Ethne*. Hybla Gereatis stood on the slopes of Aetna.

v. 56
mater al
posely in

vv. 5
v. 60

'ueris' w
v. 62

T aleret,
the corru
of the line

vv. 6

spumeo p
stands im

Introduct

on the su
half of it
reading in
obliterate

after the p

vv. 7

difficult, b
follow,' and
has been

v. 72

throughou
'noua elo

vv. 7

which app

vv. 7

that any

must not

historical

not involv

that of T

it is comm

fit into a

Augustus

will be m

could ha

translate

were des

these con

bring to h

Caesar wh

this is co

changed

municate

with 'pos

sons of s

nephew';

Caesars, a

'Romulo'

v. 56. *Mater alitis dei* is the reading of Buecheler adopted by Mackail. *ST* pueri mater alitis (or -as). See the introduction; 'dei' was, I believe, altered purposely in Christian times.

vv. 59-67. See Introduction.

v. 60. *ST* totis; *S* creauit, *T* crearet; *ST* uernis. I retain 'totis' but read 'ueris' with most editors.

v. 62. *Fetus*, so all editors since Pithoeus. *S* flætus, *T* fletus. *Alebat*, *S* aleret, *T* aleret, see Introduction. I suggest that the MS. reading here was due partly to the corruption 'fletus,' partly to the presence of an elision in the original version of the line.

vv. 63, 64, appear in the MSS. as a single line, *S* Tunc cruore de superbo spumeo pontus globo, *T* Tuno quiuore de superhuc spumeo pont' de glouo, which stands immediately after the ninth line of the poem. I have given my reasons in the Introduction for transposing the whole stanza, and I have reconstructed the passage on the supposition that the first half of the line in *S* is nearly correct but the second half of it a correction of an older reading, which is indicated in *T*. The astonishing reading in the first half of *T*'s line suggests that the scribe had to copy a partially obliterated passage. 'Spumeo globo' came to mean 'in its foamy sphere' only after the passage had been mutilated.

vv. 72, 73. *inbuit tenorem*, 'was the first to pass through a course' is very difficult, but not stranger Latin than 'seminali tramite' 'along a track which seeds follow,' and I believe it to be correct. It is possible however that v. 72 not v. 71 has been lost; 'gubernat' governs 'tenorem' as well as 'uenas.'

v. 72. *peruium sui* (for 'sibi') is Appuleian Latin. So, too, is the use of 'de' throughout the poem, while the language throughout the composition represents that 'noua elocutio' which is chiefly identified with the name of Appuleius.

vv. 73, 74. I have dealt in the Introduction with the repetition of the refrain which appears in the MSS. between these two lines.

vv. 74-79. With regard to this passage, which has long perplexed editors, I hold that any satisfactory emendation must fulfil the four following conditions: (1) It must not involve any transposition of vv. 74-77, since those lines state certain historical or traditional events in their historical or traditional order. (2) It must not involve any emendation of the text of the MSS. (i.e. the text of *S* corrected by that of *T*) except in the phrase 'Romuli matrem,' which is clearly corrupt, though it is common to both MSS. (3) The phrase substituted for 'Romuli matrem' must fit into a summary of Roman history from the time of Romulus to the time of Augustus; I say 'of Augustus' partly owing to a suggestion of Joest-Lips, which will be mentioned again later, partly because in the fourth century the title Caesar could hardly be applied to a reigning Emperor. (4) The emendation must translate 'prole posterum' as 'descendants of descendants,' not as 'offspring who were descendants.' I considered three alternatives which seemed to me to fulfil these conditions: (1) The reading of the text, which I translate 'that so she might bring to birth the Ramnes and Quirites, and as descendants of their descendants a Caesar who was the peer of Romulus and his great-nephew of the same name.' If this is correct, 'parem' was corrupted to 'patrem' accidentally, and 'patrem' was changed to 'matrem' by design. (2) An old conjecture, which Mr. Clementi communicated to me. Joest-Lips suggested 'Romuli, patrem,' connecting 'Romuli' with 'posterum' and 'patrem' with 'Caesarem'—'that she might bring to birth, as sons of sons of Romulus, Caesar the founder of the family and Caesar his great-nephew'; Julius Caesar is the first Caesar mentioned in Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*, and the explanation may well be correct—the change of 'Romuli' to 'Romulo' seems to me to improve the conjecture. (3) The possibility that 'Romuli

matrem' might have been originally a marginal gloss on 'pudicam uirginem' of v. 76, which was afterwards inserted in the text in a wrong position. I considered also, but finally rejected after examination of the details, the idea that the reading of the MSS. might be correct, the Romulus mentioned being the son of the Emperor Maxentius (see Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Latin Biography and Mythology*), the 'nepotem Caesarem' one of the sons of Constantine (stepson and sons of Maxentius' sister).

v. 86. The reading of S seems to me right, 'safe from further fighting because it has its own cows gathered round it.'

v. 89. The repetition of the refrain printed here follows in the MSS. v. 84; it should stand here unless the arrangement of the refrains in the third part of the poem was quite unsystematic.

v. 95. uer uenit, S fiam ut, T faciam ut; Buecheler and most editors have printed 'fiam uti.' Mr. Rackham, distrusting both this reading and 'fiet ut,' suspected that 'uer' had fallen out of the text, and I believe that the history of the passage is as follows: the author wrote VERVEIT; a copyist passed over the first VE owing to the VE which follows, while VEIT dwindled into something like VT; still later a corrector or correctors filled the gap which had arisen—'faciam' seems a correction of 'fiam' but may be an independent conjecture.

v. 97. See Introduction.

THE TIBERIANI AMNIS IN QUATRAINS.

This poem was found by Bährens in the Harleian MS. (H) only, of the fifteenth century. If the MS. version of it is treated in the same way as the MS. version of the *Peruigilium Veneris* has been treated above very similar results are obtained: (1) Though the line 'Quae fluenta,' etc. (v. 14), which Bährens shifted, can be restored to its MS. position, one other (v. 7 in my version) should be transposed from other than metrical considerations. (2) When this line is so transposed, there being lacunae of single words only in H, this poem too appears to have been composed in quatrains. (3) The three accentual lines, which H exhibits, can easily be emended into quantitative verse, while in this case we know that the author habitually wrote poetry under the quantitative rules of prosody.

If my reconstructions of these two poems are even approximately correct, the resemblances between them are remarkable, viz.: (1) The division of the text of both poems into quatrains, (2) the use in both of them of quadrisyllables in the sonorous passages, (3) the Appuleian characteristics of the two writers (see note on v. 72 of the *Peruigilium Veneris*, and notice the form 'fraglabat' in v. 8 of the *Amnis*), (4) the play of fancy and the preferential use of Dione as the title of the goddess in both poems. Surely we should in future boldly ascribe both poems, as Bährens and other editors have already done with hesitation, to the same author, Tiberianus?

My use of asterisks and italics is the same in this poem as it was in the former, and the lines are numbered and referred to on the same principles in both cases.

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1 Amnis ibat inter *herbas ualle fusus frigida, | [1 |
| 2 Luce ridens calculorum, flore pictus herbido; | [2 |
| 3 Caerulas superne laurus et *uirecta myrtea | [3 |
| 4 Leniter motabat aura blandiente sibilo. | [4 |
| 5 Subter autem molle gramen flore adulto creuerat; | [5 |
| 6 *Et croco solum rubebat et *rubebat liliis. | [6 |
| 7 *Roscidum *nemus *rigebat *inter *uda *gramina, | [11 |
| 8 *Tum nemus *fraglabat omne spiritu *uiolarii. | [7 |

v. 1.
v. 3.
where.
v. 6.
is a botan
trees, the
'lilia' (a
were lilies
a purple
of the a
probably
possibility
v. 7.
as the 'l
'gramen'
of v. 6,
positions
v. 8.
'fragraba
uiolar
vi- was p
of 'uiolar
placed be
v. 9.
gratias';
of words
appellant
reasons g
v. 11
not seem
eminebat
error two
on account
all that th
Does
or was th
v. 14
which I b

9	Inter ista dona ueris et *Dionae gratias,	[8
10	Omnium regina odorum uel colorum Lucifer,	[9
11	*Aureo *praeeminebat *flore *uel *forma rosa;	[10
12	Fonte crebro murmurabant hinc et inde riui.	[12
13	Antra muscus et uirentes intus hederæ uinxerant,	[13
14	*Qua fluenta labebunda *gurgite ibant *lucido.	[14
15	Has per umbras omnis ales, plus canora quam putes,	[15
16	Cantibus uernis strepebat et susurris dulcibus;	[16
17	Hinc loquentis murmur amnis concinebat frondibus,	[17
18	Quas melos uocalis auræ, musa Zephyri, mouerat.	[18
19	Sic euntem per uirecta pulchra odora et musica	[19
20	Ales, amnis, aura, lucus, flos et umbra iuuerat.	[20

v. 1. *herbas*. So *H*.

NOTES.

v. 3. *superne*. The last syllable is short as in Horace, *Odes* 2; 20, 11, and elsewhere. 'Laurus' and 'uirecta' are both missing in *H*.

v. 6. *rubebat*, *H* *lucebat*—an accentual reading—and the emendation of the line is a botanical problem. Did Tiberianus, who observed from Nature, see the bay-trees, the myrtles, and the 'crocus uernus' in Italy, Africa, or France? And what 'lilia' (a wide term in Latin) did he see growing with that crocus? If the 'lilia' were lilies of the valley or wood anemones read 'nitebat,' but the purple fritillary or a purple iris or the red anemone seem to me more likely flowers. I add the third of the above because the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* regards that flower as being probably the 'lilium rubens' of Pliny 21. 5. 11. The wild tulip is perhaps another possibility.

v. 7. This line appears in *H* after the line 'aureo . . . rosa,' i.e. as No. 11, but as the 'nemus' and 'gramina' in it are clearly the same as the 'nemus' and 'gramen' of vv. 5 and 8, the line can hardly be placed anywhere except here. 'Et' of v. 6, 'tum' of v. 8, can then be restored to their MS. positions, i.e. to their positions in my text.

v. 8. *fraglabat*. So *H*. It is the form which Appuleius invariably used for 'fragrabat.'

uiolarii. The MS. line ends 'uiolarum spiritu,' an accentual reading in which *ui-* was pronounced as an accented syllable. I suggest that the dots over the two *i*'s of 'uiolarii' were mistaken for a line; the word was then read as 'uiolarum' and placed before 'spiritu' that the line might scan.

v. 9. *Dionae*. *H* has 'et gratias' only; Bährens conjectured 'gemmeasque gratias'; I suggest 'et Dionae' partly because an Appuleian would seize on the play of words 'dona' and 'Dionae' (cf. 'mellita . . . mollita,' in one clause, 'puellam appellat,' together, from a couple of pages of Cupid and Psyche), but chiefly for the reasons given in the following note.

v. 11. *H* has 'Auro flore praeeminebat forma Dionis rosa.' The third word does not seem to exist, and the verse is clearly much corrupted. I consider that 'praeeminebat' originally stood in the text, and that 'Diones,' having been omitted by error two lines above, was written in the margin and then later inserted in this line on account of 'rosa' (Venus' flower); the MS. line is an attempt to fit into one line all that then stood in the text.

Does 'aureo' refer only to the anthers of the flower, or does it mean 'beautiful,' or was the Austrian brier already known in the Roman world?

v. 14. *H* 'Quae fluenta labebunda guttis ibant lucidis,' an accentual reading, which I believe to have been due to the elision in the original verse.

J. A. FORT.

MODERN GREEK DVANDVA COMPOUNDS.

I HAVE not had the advantage of seeing H. C. Muller's treatise on word-composition in Greek (Leiden, 1896) referred to in his note on Greek Dvandva compounds in the January issue of the *Classical Quarterly*. But I venture to add a few more words, chosen without special research, to confirm the curious facility, which he notes, of mediaeval and modern Greek in the formation of these compounds.

φαγοπότι, meat and drink, 'a feast.' (Passow, *Popularia Carmina*, 49, 11, etc.)
σελλοχαλινωμένος, saddled and bridled. (Διγενής, 881. ed. Lambros; Paris, 1880, etc.)

λιθαρομαργαρίταρο, precious stones and pearls. (*Imberios et Margarona*, ed. Lambros, 422.)

μαχαιροσείρουνο, knife and fork.
ἀνδρόγυνο, man and wife, 'couple.'
γυναικόπαιδα, women and children.

The three last words are in common colloquial use.

μελανόλευκος, black and white.

νερόχιονο, rain and snow.

ῤνζόγαλο, rice and milk.

χειροπόδα (adv.), hand and foot.

φωτοσκίασις (φωτοσκιάζω) is hardly a genuine Greek formation, being a journalistic translation of *chiaroscuro*.

During the war such formations as Γερμανοβούλγαροι, the Germans and Bulgarians; Ἀγγλογάλλοι, the English and French, were common in the Greek newspapers.

JOHN MAVROGORDATO.

NOTE ON THE ABSTRVSA GLOSSARY.

I OFFER for what it is worth the following suggested explanation of the surprising statement of the Abstrusa Glossary: 'Fauonius solis radius qui nonnumquam uitro aut argento repercussus uagi ac tremuli fulgoris aemula claritate resplendet' (72, 29; *vide* Mr. H. J. Thomson's article in the April number of the *Classical Quarterly*, p. 87). The language suggests a rhetorical prose work rather than a grammarian's note, and the following variants seem to offer a clue to what has taken place: (1) Cod. Leid. 67 E. quoted in the above-mentioned article has 'Fauonius etiam dicitur solis radius,' etc. (2) *Lib. Gloss.* 197, 21 reads: 'Fauonius uentus fauonius dicitur etiam solis radius,' etc. Hence perhaps we have here a conflation of two distinct glosses, produced in the process of alphabetical compilation: (1) 'Fauonius: uentus.' (2) A note on Verg. *Aen.* VIII. 22 sqq. 'Fauorinus etiam dicit "solis radius . . . resplendet,"' a citation of a parallel passage from some work of Favorinus.

'Fauorinus' would readily be corrupted into 'Fauonius,' and as a corollary 'dicit' would be altered to 'dicitur'; subsequently, in the course of alphabetical arrangement, the two notes were welded into one.

R. J. SHACKLE.

AUGUSTUS AND HIS LEGIONARIES.

IN the *Monumentum Ancyranum* Augustus makes some interesting and, if we can unravel them, undoubtedly important statements, from which certain deductions seem possible as to the number of his legionary soldiers, the rate of mortality among them, their length of service and the provisions made for them after their discharge. Quite early in the *Monument* (I. 16-19) we get the following general assertion: 'About five hundred thousand Roman citizens were bound to me by the military oath. Of these, after the due expiry of their service, I settled in colonies or sent back to their own *municipia* somewhat more than three hundred thousand. And to all of them I gave land purchased by myself, or in lieu of land sums of money out of my own resources.' From the place of this statement in that part of the record relating to his earlier career we might be tempted to infer (a) that the five hundred thousand legionaries were those who formed his armies at the time of Antony's collapse, and (b) that the discharge of three hundred thousand of them, whether planted in colonies or sent back to their domiciles, took place at one and the same time. With regard to the second point, we shall see presently that the vague and indiscriminate statement made here is cleared up by a later passage (III. 22 sqq.), from which it appears that the assignation of land belongs to two distinct schemes of colonization, separated by sixteen years, and that the restoration of discharged soldiers to their municipalities, to whom alone the words '*pecuniam pro agris dedi*' are applicable, belongs to a still later date. But these facts, not discoverable in the statement as it stands, negative the supposition that the five hundred thousand were those enlisted at or up to the date of 31 B.C. For, apart from the impossibility of assuming that Octavian had, or had had at that date, something like eighty-three legions, it is clear that Augustus wishes to represent the number of discharged soldiers provided for as three-fifths of the total number enlisted. It follows that by 2 B.C., the last date, as we shall see, at which discharged soldiers were provided for in considerable numbers, the total of those enlisted must have increased largely since thirty years earlier, and if it had been five hundred thousand then, the proportion given between the numbers of those enlisted and those provided for would have been in utter contradiction to the facts. Who, then, are included under the five hundred thousand Roman citizens who took the military oath to Augustus? It can hardly be doubted that the number included all those enlisted in the legions from some *terminus a quo* to be determined presently down to the date of the statement under consideration. It would follow that about one hundred and fifty thousand out of the total were actually serving at this latter date in the twenty-five legions, which

as we know from Tac. *Ann.* iv. 5 were in existence at the end of Augustus' reign. To establish an exact *terminus a quo* for the enlistment of the five hundred thousand is not so easy. But a practical starting-point can be found. All the legionaries who had formed Octavian's armies, both against Antony in 44 and 43 B.C. and in alliance with him during the Philippi campaign, must be eliminated. The bulk of them along with Antony's veterans had been disposed of by a series of land assignments, carried out not by purchase but by confiscation, and in short by methods which Augustus wished to be forgotten, not recorded. Of course, during the years which followed down to the final breach with Antony, Octavian had numerous legions in Gaul, in Spain, and in Illyricum. All these, we must suppose, and no doubt a large number of recruits from the western provinces joined in the oath of allegiance and service to Octavian, which, as he himself records, was taken by these provinces at the time when they called upon him to assume the command in the coming campaign, and when, in his own words, he was 'per consensum uniuersorum potitus omnium rerum.'

I conclude therefore that, in attempting to account for the total of five hundred thousand legionaries specified by Augustus, we must start from the situation in 32 or 31 B.C., and reckon as the first instalment towards that total the army, so far as it consisted of legions, which was under the command of Octavian, when Antony and Cleopatra fled to Egypt.

Whether Octavian added to his army any of the legions taken over from Lepidus or Antony is a question difficult to answer with certainty. From the fact that in the Augustan army there were three legions numbered III, and duplicates of IV, V, VI, and X, it may be inferred with some probability that at least six legions were taken over from these two armies.¹ But in the statement of the *Monument* under consideration Augustus is clearly concerned to make the proportion of soldiers provided for appear as large as possible in comparison with the number enlisted, and therefore, though these six legions had of course transferred their oath of allegiance to him, it seems to me very probable that he does not include them in the total of five hundred thousand. I shall at any rate assume this in the calculations which follow.

Of the legionary army, at the disposal of Augustus in 31 B.C., he retained a portion and discharged a portion. Those discharged, naturally the veterans, who had already served their time, were settled, in a manner to be discussed below, in Italian colonies. I am only concerned for the moment with the number so disposed of, and this seems to be indicated by a statement of Augustus that along with other largesses belonging to the year 29 B.C.

¹ Besides III Augusta there were III Gallica and III Cyrenaica, the former perhaps from the army of Antony, the latter from that of Lepidus. The duplicates were IV Macedonica and IV Scythica: V Alauda and V Macedonica: VI Val. Victr. and VI Ferrata, the latter always an Oriental legion: X Gemina and X Fretensis. Of course both Antony and Lepidus had a large number of legions, but these were probably for

the most part *uernaculae*, and perhaps even composed to some extent of slaves, like the army of Sex. Pompeius. If this was the case, we can understand why Augustus incorporated so few in his own army. They would not be of the best material. The slaves might be handed back to their masters, like those in the Sicilian army, while the rest would be simply disbanded.

'acceperu
uiginti mi
military c
twenty th
With reg
forward b
that he ha
of his own
the armie
counted an
as the fir
legionary
sents the
forty-four
legions for
the last fi
need few r
while the
end of the
retained o
number o
of fact, th
great bulk
or sets of
believe, ne
in or abou
recruiting
perhaps to
ing 7 B.C.
pensions.
fresh legion
disaster), a

When
hundred an
either by th
vided for (3
bled, or as h
the excepti
campaigns
there was n
beyond des
losses there

¹ Mommsen
Augustus only
that legions X

'acceperunt triumphale congiarium in coloniis hominum circiter centum et viginti milia' (III. 19). If this, as seems probable, refers to the newly settled military colonists of the previous year, we have accounted for one hundred and twenty thousand out of the three hundred thousand legionaries provided for. With regard to the legions retained by Augustus, I adhere to the view put forward by me many years ago (*Stud. in Rom. Hist.*, 1st series, pp. 162-179), that he had during the earlier portion of his reign twenty-two legions, sixteen of his own, numbered I to XVI, and the six already referred to taken over from the armies of Lepidus and Antony.¹ On the assumption that these were not counted among the five hundred thousand enlisted by Augustus himself, we get as the first contribution towards that total, 96,000 men, or, with the 120,000 legionary colonists added, 212,000. There remain 288,000, a figure which represents the total number of Roman citizens enlisting in the legions during the forty-four years from 30 B.C. to 14 A.D. We may take the average number of legions for the whole time as twenty-two, for, though there were twenty-five in the last five or six years, the legions newly raised in the Pannonian war would need few recruits during the short interval between their creation and 14 A.D., while the recruiting for some of the other legions must have been small at the end of the reign, if we may judge by the number of time-expired veterans retained on active service. On these figures then, it would seem, the average number of recruits for each legion every year was 293. But, as a matter of fact, there can hardly be said to have been an annual average, since the great bulk of the new soldiers must have been recruited in particular years or sets of years, which can be specified. Thus if, as we shall see reason to believe, nearly one hundred thousand veterans were settled on provincial land in or about 14 B.C., there must have been at this point exceptionally heavy recruiting to supply the gaps so caused. The same would be true, though perhaps to a less extent and spread over more years, when in the years following 7 B.C. large numbers of veterans were sent back to their domiciles with pensions. (See below.) Once more, between 6 and 10 A.D. no fewer than six fresh legions were enrolled (four in the Pannonian war and two after the Varian disaster), and this by itself would mean the raising of 36,000 recruits.

When we turn to the other side of the balance, it is clear that since four hundred and fifty thousand out of the five hundred thousand are accounted for, either by those still serving in 14 A.D. (150,000) or by those discharged and provided for (300,000), only fifty thousand are left to be classified as killed or disabled, or as having died during their years of service. It is no doubt true that, with the exception of the German campaigns of Drusus and Tiberius, the Pannonian campaigns of the latter, after Agrippa's death and the great Pannonian rebellion, there was no really heavy fighting during the reign. There was little otherwise beyond desultory frontier warfare and occasional punitive raids, and whatever losses there were, would in all probability fall more upon the auxiliary troops

¹ Mommsen held that in addition to these six Augustus only retained twelve of his own, and that legions XIII to XX were all created in the

course of the Pannonian rebellion. I have given reasons against this view in the paper referred to above.

than on the legions. But at the same time, when we remember that 18,000 were lost with Varus at one blow, and that the Pannonian war was 'grauissimum omnium externorum bellorum post Punica,' this total seems extraordinarily small. If the view taken above is accepted as probable, that the six duplicate legions were not included in the five hundred thousand, we can add 36,000 more to the casualty list, while a few thousands more can be added by supposing that the twenty-five legions were not all up to their full strength in 14 A.D., and that therefore 150,000 is an over-estimate.

The points, however, hitherto discussed, though deducible from the statement in the *Monument*, are not those on which Augustus himself intended to lay stress. What he is recording is the extremely large proportion of those who, having completed their term of service, were provided for by means of his liberality. He returns to this point, and at the same time clears up much that was left ambiguous in the general statement. In III. 22 sqq., Augustus declares: 'In my fourth consulship (30 B.C.), and afterwards in the consulship of M. Crassus and Gn. Lentulus the augur (14 B.C.), I handed over sums of money to the municipalities in payment for the land which I assigned to my soldiers. The total amount so paid was about six hundred million sesterces for Italian land, and about two hundred and sixty million sesterces for provincial land. Of all who ever planted colonies of soldiers in Italy or in the provinces, I was the first and only statesman down to my own age to take this course.'

It appears therefore that the settlement of soldiers on land mentioned in the earlier passage took place on two occasions, in 30 and in 14 B.C., while we shall see reason to connect the former with the purchase of Italian land, and the latter with the acquisition of land in the provinces. For the colonization in 30 B.C. we get valuable information from Hyginus (*de lim.* p. 77, Lachm.) and Dio Cassius (51, 4). Hyginus declares that Augustus, after restoring peace to the world, provided by means of colonization both for the armies of Antony and Lepidus, which had come over to him, and for the soldiers of his own legions. He goes on to specify three classes of colonies thus established. (a) The towns which had favoured Antony were practically cleared of their inhabitants, and repopled by military colonists. (b) Old established communities received large numbers of military settlers, and with them the title of colonies. (c) Some ancient and obsolete foundations received large accessions of citizens and in some cases of land, and at the same time recovered their lost rank as colonies. On two points this statement probably needs correction and receives it from Dio Cassius. He makes it clear (1) that land was not assigned, as we should hardly expect that it would be, to the soldiers of Antony and Lepidus, but only to his own veterans (τοῖς διὰ πάντος αὐτῷ συστρατεύσασιν), and (2) that the colonies were in Italy only, and not, as Hyginus states, also in the provinces. Dio also supplies the omission of Hyginus to make it clear that the land required was, as Augustus himself declares, purchased. But it was clearly not all paid for, as the *Monument* would lead us to believe, but only in the case of those communities

which had possibly
that the e
settle at
military c
civilian co
to the se
were to b
price of la
what othe
have alre
settled in
colonies s
which Au
populous

With
or more
there is
explicitly
year Dio
matter be
and Spain
was prob
legionarie
expecting
years' ter
and had b
these prov
a few year
provincia
foundatio

¹ In V. 35
in which h
Mommse
Emona, Sal
Illyricum is
reasons are
ricum was p
under the
Macedonia.
disium and
Actium, Ma
and Illyricu
had become
paigns betw
he would h
province. I
as much a s
finds a place
promised his

which had not sided with Antony. Another detail is given by Dio which may possibly explain the words in 'prouinciis' in the account of Hyginus. It appears that the expropriated inhabitants of the hostile communities were allowed to settle at Dyrrachium, Philippi, and elsewhere. These were of course not military colonies, but it is by no means certain that they were not organized as civilian colonies; and as these settlements were in a way a necessary supplement to the scheme of Italian colonization, unless the dispossessed populations were to become a scandal and a danger, it is even possible that the purchase price of land in Macedonia and perhaps also in Illyricum was included under what otherwise seems the enormous sum of six hundred million sesterces. We have already inferred from III. 19 that the number of military colonists settled in Italy at this time was one hundred and twenty thousand, and the colonies so established were no doubt the twenty-eight 'meis auspiciis deductae,' which Augustus declares to have been in the highest degree flourishing and populous (V. 37).¹

With regard to the second assignment of land to soldiers in 14 B.C., or more strictly to the sums of money paid to municipalities in that year, there is evidence for connecting it, though Augustus does not himself explicitly connect it, with the purchase of provincial land. Under this year Dio Cassius makes an explicit statement which seems to place the matter beyond all doubt. 'At this time he colonized numerous cities in Gaul and Spain' (54, 23). During the earlier part of the reign the term of service was probably twenty years, so that there would be a large number of legionaries recruited just before Actium who in 14 B.C. would be impatiently expecting their *honesta missio*. Nor is it unlikely that a demand for a sixteen years' term was making itself heard.² Augustus, who at this time was in Gaul and had been in Spain, must have been aware of the temper of the legions in these provinces, and perhaps anticipating the twenty years' term of service by a few years, made the satisfaction of these demands fit in with his schemes of provincial organization by establishing or re-establishing numerous colonial foundations in the Spanish provinces and Narbonensis. In Pliny's lists, which

¹ In V. 35 Augustus enumerates the provinces in which he planted colonies of soldiers, and Mommsen is much exercised because, though Emona, Salona, Narona and Iader were colonies, Illyricum is absent from the list. Two possible reasons are suggested for its absence. (1) Illyricum was perhaps not a separate province, but under the administration of the governor of Macedonia. But between the treaty of Brundisium and the unification of the empire after Actium, Macedonia had belonged to Antony, and Illyricum to Octavian, and as Illyricum had become important through his own campaigns between 36 and 33 B.C., it is unlikely that he would have at once merged it in another province. In any case, Illyricum was certainly as much a separate province as Pisidia, which finds a place in the list. (2) Augustus may have promised his veterans lands in Italy, and then,

unable to get sufficient land to fulfil his promise, he may have settled some in Illyricum, a breach of promise which he would be anxious to keep out of sight, and therefore omits Illyricum from his list. On this it seems enough to ask, why, even if at the time he could persuade his veterans that they were settled in Italy, when they were really in Illyricum, should he still have had recourse to this futile expedient in drawing up his record forty-four years later? I make the suggestion, for what it is worth, that these places in Illyricum were not military colonies at all, but are covered by Dio's 'elsewhere,' and that, like Dyrrachium and Philippi, they received settlements of dispossessed Italians.

² This, as we shall see, was granted in 13 B.C., in consequence no doubt of urgent demands on the part of the soldiers.

here represent the Augustan period, Baetica is credited with nine colonies, Tarraconensis with twelve, and Lusitania with five, and though many of these were Caesarian, even these may have received fresh colonists from Augustus at this time. In Narbonensis, so far as we can judge, there is little room for fresh foundations, so thorough had been Caesar's scheme of colonization. But many Latin colonies may have become Roman with accessions of military colonists.

Of course the colonization of this year may have extended to some of the other provinces specified by Augustus in V. 35, and not been limited to Spain and Gaul, and at any rate all soldiers settled would be included under the *trecenta milia*. But it cannot be supposed that all the military colonies in the provinces dated from the same year. Nor does Augustus imply this. He merely states that the payment of two hundred and sixty million sesterces was made in this year. The liability for some of this money may have been incurred in years antecedent to 14 B.C., though the new policy adopted in the following year (see below) makes it impossible to place any of the Augustan military colonies later than this time. There is no confirmation of the statement that the land required for these colonies was paid for, but it may well have been true as regards those in Gaul and Spain, where Augustus had considerable financial resources at his disposal. At the same time, it is difficult to believe that, when military colonies were established in Pisidia, payment for the land was made to the tribes, for whose coercion they were planted. We have therefore no means of determining with any exactitude either how many of the *trecenta milia* were provided for in 14 B.C., or how many were settled at the cost of two hundred and sixty million sesterces. No doubt provincial land was cheaper than Italian, and if six hundred million sesterces could purchase enough of the latter for one hundred and twenty thousand, we might suggest that two hundred and sixty million provide for not less than eighty thousand on the former, but such an estimate is clearly too uncertain to be of any use. It may be, however, that a consideration of the next statement in the *Monument* may lead us to an approximate estimate of the total number provided for by provincial colonies, whether all were paid for out of the sum given by Augustus or not.

As has been already pointed out, a very large number of recruits must have joined the legions about this time. The twenty-two legions would number about 132,000 men, and at the lowest estimate more than half of these were discharged in or shortly before 14 B.C. An equivalent number therefore must have been enlisted about the same time.

This extensive colonization had no doubt been a necessary step, but it had also been a laborious and costly task, and Augustus was not willing to face it again. He accordingly announced a new policy which, while lessening the rewards attaching to *honesta missio*, made them more definite and certain, and shortened the length of service required to qualify for them. Under the year 13 B.C. Dio Cassius states (54, 25): 'He promulgated rules as to the number of years the citizens should serve in the army, and as to the amount of money they

should receive which they enlisted for this score while the date, for sometime was now

During prolonged and the can have worked on record in

'And and D. L. M. Messa on the sol municipia hundred ment of soldiers of this grade perhaps 320,000 we knew course de that we k to twenty at 12,000 length of money al in 13 B.C. about 66, specified accounts have to i discharge the 12,000 numerous difficulty sesterces

A qu how ther

should receive as a reward when discharge from service in lieu of the land which they were always demanding. His object was that the soldiers, being enlisted henceforth on certain definite terms, should find no excuse for revolt on this score. The number of years was 12 for praetorians, and 16 for the rest, while the money to be distributed was less in some cases and more in others. 'It is not of course necessary to suppose that land was never given after this date, for the complaints made by some of the mutineers in 14 A.D. imply that it sometimes was, but it never could have been on a large scale, and the system was now for each soldier on discharge to receive a sum of money.

During the years which followed there was some of the heaviest and most prolonged fighting of the reign in the German wars of Drusus and Tiberius and the Pannonian campaigns of the latter, and in the west at any rate there can have been little opportunity of working the new system. But it was worked on a somewhat extensive scale in the years following 7 B.C., as the next record in the *Monument* informs us (III. 28 sqq.).

'And afterwards in the consulship of Tib. Nero and Gn. Piso, and A. Antistius and D. Laelius, and of G. Calvisius and L. Pasienus, and of L. Lentulus and M. Messalla, and of L. Caninius and Q. Fabricius, I bestowed rewards in money on the soldiers whom, after the completion of their service, I sent back to their own *municipia*. And for this purpose with ungrudging liberality I expended four hundred million sesterces.' This clears up another ambiguity in the general statement of I. 16, and shows that the words '*pecuniam pro agris*' refer to those soldiers only who were sent back to their *municipia*. The years during which this gradual discharge of soldiers took place were 7, 6, 4, 3 and 2 B.C., 5 B.C. being perhaps omitted owing to a large sum distributed to the people (there were 320,000 recipients of 60 *denarii*) when G. Caesar assumed the *toga uirilis*. If we knew the amount of pension fixed for legionaries in 13 B.C., we could of course determine the number of men discharged during these five years. All that we know is that in 5 A.D. Augustus again lengthened the term of service to twenty years, and at the same time fixed the retiring allowance for legionaries at 12,000 sesterces (Dio Cass. 55, 25). As a compensation for the increased length of service, we may assume that Augustus appreciably augmented the money allowance, and if we conjecture that it had been fixed at 6,000 sesterces in 13 B.C. we shall probably be not far from the truth. On that computation about 66,000 would have been discharged and rewarded during the five years specified by Augustus. This figure, added to the 120,000 settled in 30 B.C., accounts for 188,000 out of the *trecenta milia*, and leaves 112,000, which will have to include all the military colonies in the provinces, and also any soldiers discharged after 6 A.D. and receiving from the newly established *aerarium militare* the 12,000 sesterces fixed in the previous year. These would not be very numerous for reasons given below, but their necessary inclusion adds to our difficulty in determining the number provided for by the four hundred million sesterces paid out between 7 and 2 B.C.

A question, to which no entirely satisfactory answer can be supplied, is how there came to be 66,000 men with sixteen years' service at their back

between 7 and 2 B.C., for that number amounts to exactly half the total legionary force at the time, twenty-two legions. It would mean that these men, if at the time of their discharge they had completed their term of service, must have been enlisted from 23 to 18 B.C. But there is not a trace of any great military activity at that date to account for such exceptional recruiting during those years. Moreover, these men would have been serving in 14 B.C., when, as we have seen, something like 80,000 men were settled on provincial land. But in this case we should have to assume that at the opening of 14 B.C. the legionary force consisted of 66,000 men whose length of service ranged from nine to four years, and about 80,000 who were to be discharged in the course of the year, in other words of little short of 150,000. How is this possible at a time when there were only twenty-two legions? I can only suggest that the words of Augustus, 'after the completion of their service,' are not to be pressed, and that a large proportion of the 66,000 now discharged had been enlisted as recently as 14 B.C., and that their discharge was due not to length of service, but to the severity of the German and Pannonian and perhaps Thracian and Moesian fighting since 13 B.C.¹ At any rate, while this process of expediting the *honesta missio* was going on, recruiting must again have been very active, and eight years after 2 B.C., i.e. A.D. 5, we find the legions again dissatisfied. We learn from Dio Cassius (55, 23) that 'the soldiers were sorely displeased at the paltry character of the rewards given to them, and at the wars waged at this time, and none consented to bear arms longer than the regular period of service. It was therefore voted that twenty thousand sesterces should be given to members of the praetorian cohorts when they had served sixteen years, and twelve thousand sesterces to the other soldiers when they had served twenty years. This was followed in the next year by the establishment of the *aerarium militare* as recorded in the *Monument III*. 38: 'ex quo praemia darentur militibus qui uicena aut plura stipendia emeruissent.' We can hardly believe that this new scheme of regular discharge and pension was ever in full working order during the life of Augustus. The Pannonian rebellion began in the same year, and during its three years' course four new legions, XVII-XX, were created. Three of these, XVII-XIX, were destroyed with Varus, but two more, XXI and XXII, were enrolled, and the legionary budget must have been heavy for the remainder of the reign. That postponement of discharge and non-payment of retiring allowances were among the chief grievances which led to the mutinies in Pannonia and Germany after the death of Augustus we know from the account of Tacitus, and it must be admitted that up to the end of his reign Augustus, in spite of repeated attempts to solve the problem, had not succeeded in developing a system of *honesta missio* which was at once workable and satisfactory to the soldiers.

E. G. HARDY.

¹ Not all, however, who had shared in these campaigns were discharged, for the veterans complaining of thirty years' service in the mutiny

of 15 A.D. must have been among those enlisted in 14 B.C.

[IMPROVED
enable
on the
already
Readers wi
destructi
These sum
periodic
books p

Ameri

S. E. F.

of the Ancien
Greek litera
end of the
rhythmical
-ns. Collec
Plautus. T
round Curio
chief were c
among them
ment of I.
accusative

XLI.

†K. F.

of Plato Re
Gyges) thro
use in the
unlike the a
W. A. Hei
of Josephu
banished th
as a *hierodu*
In III. 11.
as well as c
Tiberius. T
hostile opin
and Hermi
elsewhere,
book of the

XLI.

H. W.

of some t
Tragicorum
Aeneid. T
Epicureani
of his art.
the value o
alphabetic

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

[IMPROVED communications and the goodwill of publishers of many nationalities now enable us to make good some of the recent gaps in these summaries. The notes on the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* are supplementary to those which have already appeared.

Readers will especially welcome the reappearance of the *Musée Belge* after the destruction of its plant and stock in the fire of Louvain.

These summaries will in future deal only with original work appearing in the periodicals. Reviews of important books will be mentioned in the lists of new books published in the *Classical Review*.—EDD. C.Q.]

American Journal of Philology. XL. 4. 1919.

S. E. Bassett, *The Theory of the Homeric Caesura according to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine*. Caesura (τομή) was not recognized in the classic period of Greek literature. Caesura is purely metrical and expresses the conflict between the end of the word and the end of the foot. It does not mean a pause, whether rhythmical or logical (pause in sense). E. W. Nichols, *Verbals in -tor, -ax, -dus and -ns*. Collection and classification, with comments, of these formations as used in Plautus. Tenney Frank, *Cicero and the Poetae Novi*. The young men who gathered round Curio in politics and the *poetae novi* of whom Calvus and Catullus were the chief were closely associated with Cicero from 59 till the death of the most important among them. E. W. Fay, *Declension Exponents and Case Endings*. On the development of I.E. case endings from deictic elements as *i* (*ei* in dative) and *e* or *o* in accusative singular.

XLII. 1. 1920.

†K. F. Smith, *The Literary Tradition of Gyges and Candaules*. Traces the stories of Plato *Republic* 359D (Gyges and his ring) and Herodotus I. 8-10 (Candaules and Gyges) through the subsequent literature. The vitality of the stories is due to their use in the schools of rhetoric. In the modern versions of the Herodotean story, unlike the ancient ones, the central figure has become Gyges instead of Candaules. W. A. Heidel, *Why were the Jews banished from Italy in 19 A.D.?* A close scrutiny of Josephus *Ant.* XVIII. 3, 4 and Tacitus *Annals* II. 85 suggests that Tiberius banished them because certain Jews endeavoured to procure Fulvia, a Roman lady, as a *hierodule* or temple-prostitute. Lane Cooper, *A Pun in the Rhetoric of Aristotle*. In III. 11. 1412A sqq. suggests that there is a play on *θάρρα* 'thrum on the harp' as well as on *Θάρρα εἰ* 'you are a Thracian servant-girl.' G. A. Harber, *Tacitus and Tiberius*. Tacitus' unfavourable estimate of Tiberius was based on a consensus of hostile opinion already existing. C. G. Osgood traces the confusion of Harmonia and Hermione in *Paradise Lost* IX. 506 to variants in MSS. of Statius' *Thebaid* and elsewhere, and notes that lines 133-153 in the *Ode on the Nativity* are based on the fifth book of the *Divine Institutes* of Lactantius.

XLII. 2. 1920.

H. Weir Smyth, *Unlisted Fragments of Aeschylus*. A collection, with comments, of some two dozen fragments discovered since the second edition of Nauck's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1889. Tenney Frank, *Epicurean Determinism in the Aeneid*. The sixth *Aeneid* is no proof that Virgil had abandoned his early Epicureanism for Stoicism. The semi-Stoic colouring was needed for the purposes of his art. W. A. Oldfather, *Notes on the Text of Asklepiodotus*. An examination of the value of the five copies of F, the Laurentian MS. of the *Τέχνη Τακτική*; and an alphabetic register of the Greek terms not recognized in existing dictionaries.

R. L. Ramsay, *The Latin Text of the Paris Psalter. A Collation and some Conclusions.* Thorpe's Latin text 1835 is untrustworthy.

Athenaeum (Pavia). VIII. 2. 1920.

Marco Galdi constructs a lurid picture, generalizing from hints in the fragments of the Satires of Lucilius, of the depravity and degeneracy of Roman womanhood in the late Republican era. Henrica Malcovati analyzes the three views held as to the fragments of letters attributed to Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, that they are (a) genuine, (b) a forgery, (c) part of a rhetorical exercise. She defends the theory of the forgery on the grounds that their political bias is directly opposed to what is known of Cornelia's party-leanings and of her relations to her sons and her character. She believes, however, that there were genuine letters in existence, which are alluded to in Cic. *Brut.* 58, 211, and which have been lost. Teresa Comotti disputes Lachmann's interpretation of 'tres libelli' in the distich of Propertius II. 12, 25, and the divisions based on it. Sees in *tres* only an indication of smallness, still common in vulgar parlance (cf. Catullus 'si tria notorum saucia reppererit,' and Suetonius *Gram.* 109, etc.), and cites usages of 'libelli' for 'elegies,' rather than volumes or divisions. 'Tres libelli' is thus equal to 'poche elegie,' and Lachmann's divisions fall to the ground. The Editor, C. Pascal, gives two meanings of *inuolare*, 'fly aloft' and 'steal.' In the latter sense the word is in common use in early Christian writers, in modern Italian (*involare*) and in mediaeval French (*embler*). Ancient and modern etymologists fell into the easy explanation of *uolare* 'fly' leading to *uolare* 'make fly,' i.e. 'steal.' But the Latin *uola* means the hollow of the hand. French *voler* and Italian *involare* mean 'hide in the hollow of the hand,' and P. quotes several glossaries showing this sense. In the common languages the two meanings remained distinct. For the derivation of *uola* P. prefers the connexion with Gr. εἰλλω, Att. εἶλω. The same root supplies Lat. *uoluo*, *uolumen*, Gr. εἰλῶ, εἶλμα. Compares also *uola* = κοῖλον ποδός (*Corp. Gloss. Lat.* II. 525, 13).

VIII. 3. 1920.

F. Guglielmino explains or amends several passages in the *Phormio* (491, 502-3, 508, 517, 518-19, 525-6). In 502-3 he retains the *neque* on which all the codices are agreed, and takes *alia* in sense of 'less serious,' thus explaining away an apparent contradiction which has led Dziatzko to excise the two lines as spurious. S. Sabbadini, on Hor. *Sat.* I. 9, 69 *tricesima sabbata*, makes some interesting comments on Hebraic festivals in Rome, and refers the *tricesima* to the day of the month, pointing out the difficulty of fitting in the thirtieth Sabbath with the Jewish calendar. This sense would indicate the expiatory season of the new moon. S. concludes that the two words should be separated by a comma. Horace and Aristius, the latter as some have suggested being a proselyte to Judaism, walking in the Hebrew quarter, observe signs of a double festival, the new moon (*tricesima dies*) and the Sabbath (*sabbata*). C. Pascal quoting from a poem by Politian, written in 1486, shows that he was familiar with details of a life of Lucretius hitherto only known as being prefixed to an edition published in 1492 (now in the British Museum). Hence P. concludes that there is more reason than before to infer that this life was drawn from ancient authorities and not merely concocted by Renaissance scholars. The most important article in this number is by A. Barriera, who has discovered in the miscellaneous collection of Latin works in Vat. Reg. 1587 the second 'codex vetus Danielis' believed to have been lost, and containing the *Cato Maior*. It dates from the eleventh century, found its way to Rome after wandering from France to Sweden, and is free from certain interpolations well known in L, V and P, and some that have forced their way into all the good MSS. B. proposes to publish his collation of the MS. (to be called D) in his edition of the dialogue for the *Corpus Paravianum*.

Berlin
Jan. 3
in next issue
textual criticism
antica Graecia
Aegyptus in
Jan.
graphie (P
Jan.
des Aristot
A Study
criticized,
not 'Apyri
Jan.
Entwickelun
Bedeutung
next two
Jan.
Mnesibulos
Feb.
ing.' K.
Feb.
Ovidii Ep
(1) O's th
reading.
Bemerkung
Feb.
the Azore
Feb.
Mar.
Greek Pros
next issue
writes cri
Mar.
study. K
Juvenalis.
cohort (cf
Mar.
tributes
donius und
Mar.
duction to
found in r
Apr.
attractive
reich).
Erbaunung
Apr.
Ep. 19, 9)
Apr.
ably review
τὰ μὲν τρ
20, 21, 17
δὴ τὸτ' κτ

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1920.

Jan. 3. E. Schwartz, *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* (Münscher), continued in next issue. S. postulates a redactor for speeches and documents, and writes on textual criticism. M. outlines the former theme. G. Loria, *Le Scienze esatte nell' antica Graecia* (Tittel). A second and improved edition. E. Assmann contributes *Ägypten in Troja und in Boiotien*.

Jan. 10. K. Trüdinger, *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie* (Philipp). 'Valuable.' W. Bannier contributes *Zu attischen Inschriften*. XI.

Jan. 17. H. Meyer, *Platon und die aristotelische Ethik; Das Vererbungsproblem des Aristoteles; Natur und Kunst bei Aristoteles* (Nestle). All commended. L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions* (Hofmann). Much criticized, especially for omissions. In *Arete* K. Kunst explains the name ('Ἀρετή, not Ἀρητή) and compares her with Persephone.

Jan. 24. A. Pott, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments nach seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Thomsen). A second edition, with improvements. E. Lerch, *Die Bedeutung der Modi im Französischen* (Wolterstorff). A long discussion, continued in next two issues. K. Löschhorn, *Zu Laevius, Calvus, und den Priapea*. Textual notes.

Jan. 31. C. Rüger writes *Zur pseudodemosthenischen Rede gegen Euergos und Mnesibulos* (47).

Feb. 7. O. Wichmann, *Platos Lehre vom Instinkt und Genie* (Steiner). 'Interesting.' K. Münscher contributes *Noch einmal Isokrates VIII*. 86.

Feb. 14. G. Némethy, *Commentarius exegeticus ad Ovidii Tristia*; another *ad Ovidii Epistulas ex Ponto* (Magnus). The notes are weak; two *excursus* to Tr., (1) O.'s third wife was not a Fabia, (2) the cause of his *relegatio*, are quite worth reading. A. Kurfess, *Zu Ps.-Cic. inv. in Sall. 7, 19*. K. Löschhorn, *Kleine kritische Bemerkungen zu Propertius*.

Feb. 21. In *Die platonische Atlantis*, continued in next issue, Th. Arldt thinks the Azores area has the best claim.

Feb. 28. L. Weniger, *Altgriechischer Baumkultus* (Roscher). 'Meritorious.'

Mar. 6. A. W. de Groot, *A Handbook of antique Prose-Rhythm. I. History of Greek Prose-Metre*, and dissertation *De numero oratorio Latino* (Ammon), continued in next issue. 'Unites sureness in method with critical acumen.' A. Zimmermann writes critical notes *Zu den Homerischen Hymnen und Epigrammen*.

Mar. 13. H. Güntert, *Kalypso* (K. F. W. Schmidt). A meritorious philological study. K. Löschhorn contributes *Einige Worte über die Verbannung des D. Junius Juvenalis*. J., banished by Hadrian to Britain, where he had served as tribune of a cohort (cf. *Inscr. Neap.* 4312 Mommsen), died some time after 127.

Mar. 20. H. v. Kiesling, *Damaskus* (Thomsen). Interesting. R. Munz contributes *Über die wissenschaftliche Durchführung der biologischen Klimatheorie bei Posidonius und ein daran sich anschliessendes Fragment bei Strabo C 695 sq.*

Mar. 27. H. Schäfer, *Von ägyptischer Kunst* (v. Bissing). A weighty introduction to the subject. In *Fastenfragment aus Ostia*, Ch. Hülsen describes a stone found in 1916 near the Forum and relating to 36-8 A.D.

Apr. 3. F. X. Bauer, *Proklos von Konstantinopel* (A. L. Mayer). Good and attractively written. P. Jourdan, *Notes de critique verbale sur Scribonius Largus* (Helmreich). Contributions: E. Bethé, *Die Zeit unserer Ilias*, and P. Wolters, *Die Erbauungszeit des Heraions zu Olympia*, both answering Drerup.

Apr. 10. O. Rossbach writes *Zwei Schriften des Maecenas. Prometheus* (Seneca Ep. 19, 9) is subjective, as is *De cultu* (sc. corporis) suo (*ibid.* 114, 5).

Apr. 17. J. Vürtheim, *Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie* (Seeliger). Favourably reviewed. A. Ludwig, *Zu den Homerischen Hymnen auf Dionysos*. Read *ὡς δὲ τὰ μὲν τράσοι πάντως, τριτημίσιον αἰέ* at I. 11 (Allen), and later transpose thus—20, 21, 17-19: VII. 42, recast Ruhnken's conj. to *ἰδόντες Μῆδην* ('das Perserreich'), *δὴ τότε* κτλ.: VII. 55, *Μ s δὲ* 'Εκάτωρ (Lookoutman; cf. *δὲ* Εὐμαίη, etc.) is satis-

factory: XXVI. 11-13 is sound (*ῥῆμα* 'Reifezeit'; *αὐτῆς* 'in der Folge'): XXIV. 4, read *ἐνεργεία* ('tatkraftig') for *ἐπέρχεται*. Fr. Levy, *Zu Senecas Phönissen*. Mesk's views on the relation between the scenes are untenable.

Apr. 24. L. M. Hartmann and J. Kromayer, *Römische Geschichte* (Steinert). Shows 'profound knowledge, logical acuteness, and absolute devotion to the truth.' F. W. von Bissing replies to Assmann in *Ägypter in Troja und in Boiotien*?

May 1. M. Wlassak, *Zum römischen Provinzialprozess* (Kübler). Much praised. S. Brandt, *Zu Ps.-Cyprian De Pascha*; textual notes.

May 8. O. Immisch, *Agatharchidea* (Herr). Commended. K. Löschhorn, *Zu Catulls Gedichten*; critical notes. W. Soltan, *Die sicheren Geschichtsdaten des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (366-338).

May 15. E. Scharr, *Xenophons Staats- und Gesellschaftsideal und seine Zeit* (Löschhorn). 'Excellent.' N. A. Bees (Béys), *Bibelgriechisch und Neugriechisch*, on the Swede J. J. Björnsthål (ob. 1779) as a precursor of Deissmann, Moulton, etc. H. Geist, *Die Strahlenlehre des arabischen Philosophen Alkindi*. G. will produce an edition later.

May 22. A. Heisenberg, *Dialekte und Umgangssprache im Neugriechischen* (Maidhof). By a liaison-officer to the Fourth Greek Army Corps; praised on the whole. In this and the next issue F. Burg writes *Licinus, Isina und Verwandtes*, a philological study.

May 29. Ed. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt*, I. 1 (Capelle), continued in next two issues. Sixth edition of this *κτῆμα ἐς αἰ.* Nestle's share is superior to Lortzing's; C. controverts some views of each. R. Knorr, *Töpfer und Fabriken verzierter Terrasigillata des 1. Jahrhunderts* (Anthes). Has 100 very valuable illustrations. P. Boesch contributes *Zu Seneca*, Ep. 55, 7: *paries* is the intervening hill.

June 5. A. Schulte, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, and A. Souter, *A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek N.T.* (Preuschen). Schulte's is good but elementary, and has some errors. Souter, a skilful guide, gives reliable aid; references are few, and some articles unduly long; the low price (3s.) and excellent production are noted. K. Löschhorn, *Kleine kritische Bemerkungen zu den Didaskalien des Euripides*. R. Pagenstecher, *Ein Nilmosaik aus Ägypten*: found at Thmuis, it illustrates the difference between Italo-Egyptian and Alexandrino-Egyptian art.

June 12. To this and next issue H. Stürmer contributes *Zur Homerforschung*, criticizing details of H. Gerke's views (*Internat. Woch.*, 1919, pp. 595 sqq.)

June 19. G. Loeschcke, *Gelasius' Kirchengeschichte* (Preuschen). Edited posthumously by M. Heinemann; it satisfies all reasonable wishes, but has some defects textually.

June 26. A. C. Clark, *M. T. Ciceronis pro Milone, pro Marcello, pro Ligario, pro Deiotaro, Philippicae I.-XIV.*, rec. A. C. C. (Klotz). A welcome second edition, introducing new materials, and important for the criticism of Cicero's speeches. K. declines some readings; the *testimonia* are not duly regarded; and C. values his own finds of MSS. rather too highly. V. Gardthausen contributes *Das erste ägyptische Königsjahr und die Kratesis des Caesar Augustus*.

Classical Philology. XV. 1. 1920.

W. E. Clark, *The Importance of Hellenism from the Point of View of Indic Philology*. II. Continues the collection of notices in Classical and Indian sources from the time of Menander (Milinda), a Greek king in N. India in the second century B.C. down to the fourth century A.D. Tenney Frank, *Vergil's Apprenticeship I*. The *Culex*. This is imitated in Horace *Epode* 2; it should be assigned to 48 B.C., when Octavius (Augustus), to whom it is dedicated, was about fourteen and elected pontifex; it is a little epic suited to the young. *Georgics* II. 458-542 is an imitation of the same *Epode* of Horace. *Catalepton* IX. (Eulogy of Messalla) was written in

B.C. 42 (au
Philippi, an
of certain v
of Willed R
originated a
are develop
βουκολικόν.
a word (wh
idylls). J.
'informers',
reflected in
Divisions of
consideratio
edition. In
to 544 shou
later on in
interprets H.

XL. 2.

Tenney

the Virgilian
Epicurean
found himse
of Siro at N
of which the
50-40 is gi
with land-c
C. W. Men
Sermones of
to the pro
W. S. Mess
more frequ
Argues that
European La
evidence tha
'Notes and
and 'free,' a
link being th

Classical

Feb. 9.

in early Lat
deep, and i
tunnels, and
foot of arab
lake was cu
Frank's Eco
Press.

April 5

Forum of A
the early A
affixed, reco
tions have b
with the pla

B.C. 42 (autumn), when Messalla captured Octavian's camp in the first battle of Philippi, and afterwards suppressed. C. D. Buck, *A Semantic Note*. On the origin of certain words for 'forgetting' and for 'dying' or 'killing.' F. H. Fowler, *Clauses of Willed Result*. Ne- (and ut-) clauses which were not primarily substantive clauses originated as clauses of willed result, and the 'purpose' clauses and the 'stipulative' are developments of these and not derived separately from parataxis. S. E. Bassett, βουκολικόν. Discussion of this expression for a hexameter with a third foot ending in a word (which Theocritus uses in his bucolic idylls twice as frequently as in his epic idylls). J. O. Lofberg, *The Sycophant Parasite*. Notes the change of meaning from 'informer,' 'blackmailer,' to 'impostor,' 'hireling agent,' 'flatterer,' 'parasite' as reflected in the New Comedy and Plautus and Terence. R. J. Bonner, *The Book Divisions of Thucydides*. Reconstructs the division into thirteen books from a consideration of the evidence of the Scholiast and a comparison of the eight-book edition. In Notes and Discussions G. M. Bolling shows that Aristophanes' *Nubes* 537 to 544 should be understood as containing pointed references to what is to appear later on in the play (653, 734, 1206-13, 1297 sqq., 1490, 1493), and P. Shorey interprets Herodotus' criticism (1. 60) on the home-coming of Pisistratus.

XL. 2. 1920.

Tenney Frank, *Vergil's Apprenticeship*, II. Maintains, with discussion of details, the Virgilian authorship of the *Ciris* and other pieces in the *Appendix*. A pupil of the Epicurean Siro, Virgil intended at first to write a poem in the vein of Lucretius, but found himself unequal to the task. The *Ciris* was written in the Epicurean 'garden' of Siro at Naples, where Virgil may have come in contact with the oriental notions of which there are traces in the fourth *Eclogue*. A tentative chronology for the years 50-40 is given. W. L. Westermann, *Unimundated Lands in Egypt*, Part I., dealing with land-classifications, method of irrigation, and registration and assessment. C. W. Mendell, *Satire as Popular Philosophy*. Develops, with special regard to the *Sermones* of Horace, the moralizing character of Roman satire, and its resemblances to the prose dialogue which was a recognized vehicle of ethical discussion. W. S. Messer, *Mutiny in the Roman Army*. An historical sketch showing that it was more frequent than is generally believed. E. W. Fay, *The Elogium Duilianum*. Argues that it is a forgery of the age of Tiberius. C. D. Buck, *Hittite an Indo-European Language* (with addendum). There is strong but not absolutely conclusive evidence that it is so. R. J. Bonner, *The Legal Setting of Isocrates' Antidosis*. Among 'Notes and Discussions' C. D. Buck illustrates the semantic connexion of 'empty' and 'free,' and C. J. Adamec argues for the connexion of *genu* and *genus*, *gigno*, the link being the kneeling position in childbirth.

Classical Weekly. New York. 1920.

Feb. 9. An account is given of an article by Prof. Tenney Frank on *Agriculture in early Latium* (*Am. Economic Review*, June, 1919). The soil was rich but not very deep, and it supported a dense population. Numerous traces remain of drains, tunnels, and dams: e.g. below Velletri is a system of tunnels cut in order that every foot of arable ground might be saved for cultivation. The *emissarium* of the Alban lake was cut through solid rock to save a few hundred acres of arable soil. Prof. Frank's *Economic History of Rome* will shortly be published by the Johns Hopkins Press.

April 5. S. A. Hurlbut, *A Roman Hall of Fame*. The writer describes the Forum of Augustus, with its statues of Roman warriors, from Aeneas and (probably) the early Alban kings down to L. Licinius Lucullus. Beneath each tablets were affixed, recounting the titles and story of the hero. Copies of some of these inscriptions have been found at Arretium and elsewhere. Virgil may have been acquainted with the plan, and perhaps with the statues themselves: Horace may be quoting in

Carm. IV. 8. 13 sqq. from the inscriptions such phrases as 'celeres fugae' 'incendia Karthaginis impiae' to contrast them with the verses of Ennius.

April 26. E. T. Sage discusses Cicero's use of the *Senatusconsultum ultimum*, and suggests that he regarded the trial of Rabirius as a challenge to the claims of the Senate. A Petrie, *A. Latin Reader* (B. W. Mitchell). Highly praised.

May 10. E. S. Jenison, *The History of the Province of Sicily* (R. Magoffin). Includes a valuable discussion of problems of agriculture and taxation. C. K. gives an account of a paper by Professor E. K. Rand (*Harvard Studies*, XXX.) on *Young Virgil's Poetry*. R. maintains that most, if not all, of the pieces in the *Appendix Vergiliana* were in fact written by Virgil.

Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1920.

Jan. 10 and 17. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Platon* (v. Arnim). A work addressed to the larger public, and aims at understanding the man rather than his teaching. The reviewer has grave doubts as to this distinction.

Mar. 6. Nikos A. Bees (Béys), *Griechische Handschriften des Klosters Mega Spilaeon* (Lamer). Of special interest as showing that Greeks copied instead of printing in the eighteenth century under Turkish rule. O. Wichmann, *Platos Lehre von Instinkt und Genie* (Stenzel). Plato recognizes the two fundamental powers of the human spirit, conscious thought and unconscious instinct.

Mar. 13. H. H. Hofmann, *Chorlieder und Handlung in Euripides* (Weinreich).

May 22. P. Koschaker, *Neue Forschungen zum römischen Zivilprozess*. A review of works by M. Wlassak.

June 19. T. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophocles* (v. Arnim). Suggestive in many details, but unsatisfactory as to general treatment.

July 3. R. Vári, *Leonis Imperatoris Tactica*, ed. R. V. (Gerland). Published by the Budapest Academy of Letters.

Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen. 1915-17.

ARCHAEOLOGY. 1915. K. F. Kinch, *Fouilles de Vroulia (Rhodes)* (Pfuhl). A model excavation-report, though the system of grouping the pottery-finds makes reference difficult. For students of Kameiros ('Rhodio-Milesian') vases indispensable. Mme. Kinch's illustrations are both faithful and artistic. A. Schulten, *Numantia, I. Die Keltiberer und ihre Kriege mit Rom* (Bauer). An exhaustive monograph on the Celtiberians, geographical, linguistic, ethnological, and cultural evidence being fully discussed. 1916. C. Fredrich, *Vor den Dardanellen*, etc. (Kern). A model book of travel by this distinguished authority on archaeology. 1917. K. Miller, (i.) *Itineraria Romana*, (ii.) *Die Peutingersche Tafel oder Weltharte des Castorius*; Hans Gross, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Tab. Peut.* (Kubitschek). Miller's vast work is disappointing and uncritical; Gross follows a sound method, but the arrangement and press-corrections are bad.

ART. 1915. Percy Gardner, *The Principles of Greek Art* (Koepp). The reviewer finds much to commend, but regrets many omissions; he dissents from the view that sculpture is only in decline after the age of Alexander. E. R. Fiechter, *Die Baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des antiken Theaters* (Thiersch). The author presents with increased force the case for a stage, at least in the Hellenistic period, but inclines (unconvincingly) to Dörpfeld's view that the action took place in the orchestra in the fifth and fourth centuries. The second part of the work deals especially with the Roman stage and its derivation from the Hellenistic. F. Studniczka, *Das Symposion Ptolemaios II.* (Rubensohn). Treats with learning and ingenuity of the puzzling banqueting-tent of Philadelphos, described by Kallixeinos in Athenaeus. 1916. (i.) M. Bieber, *Kuchenform mit Tragödienszene*; (ii.) A. Brückner, *Maske aus dem Kerameikos* (Robert). Bieber discusses unconvincingly the stage-scene represented on a mould

of terra-cotta
the Museo
books full of

RELIGIOUS
the place of
Manichaeism
HISTORICAL

Tod, Intern
latter book
W. W. Tarn
his own su
Stein, Aegy
illuminating
Staatsrecht
theory. 19
This book
his mark, a
and original

LINGUISTICS
Wortbildung
heimischen N
of Anatolia
naïve étymol
an importan

PALAEONTOLOGY
(sous la dir
and deserve
Byzantinisch
papyri, wit
(thirty-seve
X. (Schmid
Alcaeus.

GREEK
Menander-S
fell in the w
value, and
Homer: Di
(Cauer). T
disprove his
valuable, an
Iliad took it
ca. 750 B.C.
difficulties.

(ii.) E. M. V
The former
the emenda
Ephorus as

LATIN
reasoned an
(Heinze).
all practical
Philologische
on this sma

of terra-cotta found at Ostia in 1906. 1917. (i.) H. Stuart Jones, *The Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino*; (ii.) M. Bieber, *Ant. Skulpturen und Bronzen in Cassel*. Both books full of the spirit of scientific research.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY. 1916. G. P. Wetter. Φῶς (Nilsson). Treats of the place of 'light' in religious and philosophical belief, with special reference to Manichaeism.

HISTORY. 1915. (i.) Raeder, *L'Arbitrage international chez les Hellènes*, (ii.) M. N. Tod, *International Arbitration amongst the Greeks* (Ziebarth). The reviewer prefers the latter book, and cites a few inscriptions and articles not available to the writer. 1916. W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Kolbe). The reviewer is unfavourable, and gives his own survey of the evidence and version of the events of this obscure period. A. Stein, *Aegypten unter römischer Herrschaft* (Schubart). The brief review is full of illuminating suggestions. H. Leifer, *Die Einheit des Gewaltgedankens im römischen Staatsrecht* (Gelzer). Strongly recommended to students of Roman constitutional theory. 1917. U. Kahrstedt, *Geschichte der Karthager von 218 bis 146* (Kromayer). This book completes Melzer's work of the same name. Kahrstedt often overshoots his mark, and not all his assertions stand close examination. But he shows breadth and originality in the handling of the general historical relations.

LINGUISTIC AND METRIC. 1915. N. Jokl, *Studien zur albanesischen Etymologie und Wortbildung* (Thumb). An important contribution. 1916. J. Sundwall, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier* (Danielsson). A great collection of material for the study of Anatolian names, marred by uncritical and hasty methods. E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Debrunner). This work, now completed, marks an important advance on Prellwitz.

PALAEOGRAPHY AND PAPYRI. 1915. H. Pirenne, *Album Belge de Diplomatie* (sous la direction de H.P.) (Oppermann). Admirable alike in plan and execution, and deserves to be widely known outside Belgium. A. Heissenberg and L. Wenger, *Byzantinische Papyri in München* (Partsch). A notable advance in the editing of papyri, with commentary on both literary and legal aspects. The illustrations (thirty-seven plates) are masterly. 1916. Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri X.* (Schmidt). The reviewer discusses in some detail the fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus.

GREEK LITERATURE. 1915. †S. Sudhaus, (i.) *Menandri reliquiae nuper repertae*, (ii.) *Menander-Studien* (Robert). The former work, completed in haste by the author, who fell in the war in 1914, is of standard merit. The 'studies' now reviewed are full of value, and marked by all Sudhaus' brilliance and learning. 1917. (i.) E. Bethe, *Homer: Dichtung und Sage. I.*; (ii.) Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Cauer). The former book is disappointing, and much that the author says goes to disprove his own 'dogma' of the artistic unity of the *Iliad*. W.-M.'s book is far more valuable, and his reconstruction of the 'Leben und Weben' of epic poetry before the *Iliad* took its present shape is sound. But his conclusion that the author (assigned to ca. 750 B.C.) possessed a twofold genius as creative poet and skilful editor suggests difficulties. (i.) J. H. Lipsius, *Cratippi Hellenicorum fragmenta Oxyrhynchia*; (ii.) E. M. Walker, *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, its authorship and authority (Kalinka). The former book leaves room for improvement, both in accuracy of printing and in the emendations suggested. As to the latter the reviewer considers the attribution to Ephorus as not proved, and is prepared to accept that to Cratippus.

LATIN LITERATURE. 1915. E. Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* (Pasquali). Closely reasoned and convincing in its main conclusions. A. Gercke, *Die Entstehung der Aeneis* (Heinze). The views that III. is older than I., II., V., VI., and that VII.-XII. were all practically completed before I.-VI., seem fundamentally unsound. E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Commentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Heraeus). A valuable commentary on this small but interesting pilgrim's record, and a mine of material for late Latin.

1916. A. Gudeman, *P. Cornelii Taciti de Germania* (Wissowa). The linguistic side of the commentary is the most valuable.

PHILOSOPHY. 1916. (i.) H. v. Arnim, *Plato's Jugenddialoge und die Entstehungszeit der Phaidros*; (ii.) O. Immisch, *Neue Wege zur Platonforschung* (Pohlenz). The reviewer dissents from both books. P. Rabbow, *Seelenheilung und Seelenleitung: die Therapie des Zornes* (Pohlenz). The book shows real knowledge of the subject-matter, but seriously misinterprets some of the authorities.

Hermes. LV. 1. 1920.

U. Wilcken, *Zu den Kaiserreskripten*. Takes the period from Augustus to Diocletian, and deals with the forms of rescripts, their use in practice, methods of publication and delivery, the rescripts of the *praefectus Aegypti*, and their survival till Justinian. Criticizes Preisigke (*Schriften d. Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg*, 1917) and Fuass (*Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, 1908). Rescripts were of two kinds, *epistulae* and *subscriptiones*: the latter were appended to the original petitions. These are distinguished by the praescript. In *epistulae* this is of the form $\delta\ \delta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \delta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\iota\ \chi\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\upsilon$, in *subscriptiones* $\tau\omega\ \delta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \delta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\sigma$. In practice *epistulae* were replies to applications by letter and passed through the office of the *ab epistulis*, *subscriptiones* to *libelli* through the *a libellis*. W. wants to emphasize these distinctions more than Mommsen did in the paper printed in *Juristische Schriften* II. 172 sqq. *Subscriptiones* were published in Rome by *propositio*; *epistulae* were conveyed by *insinuatio*. W. examines the Egyptian system and emends *Ox. Pap.* 1, 35. The form of rescripts is incompletely preserved by inscriptions. K. Münscher, *Zu den Persern des Aischylos*. Emendations. †B. Keil, *Ein neues Bruchstück des Diagoras von Melos*. Believes that an unpublished scholion in *Vat. Graec.* 1298 of Aristides contains two lines from a poem by D. in ionics: $\langle\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\rangle\ \delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\ \tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\theta\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma\ |\ \tau\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\delta'\ \epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\langle\sigma\rangle\epsilon\nu$ 'Ἡρακλῆς δῖος. E. Howald, *Das philosophiegeschichtliche Compendium des Areios Didymos*. An inquiry into the sources of Diogenes Laertius. MISCELLANEOUS: F. Bechtel on the Greek name Σμόκορδος. E. Meyer on $\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, meaning 'farm buildings' in Hellenistic Greek. K. Praechter on Plotinus *Ennead* 6. 1. 11. P. Groebe on the date of Cicero's *Brutus* and *Paradoxa*. M. Leumann on the history of the word *fustis*. O. Weinreich on *Apul. Metam.* 5. 4.

LV. 2. 1920.

J. Hasebroek, *Zum griechischen Bankwesen der klassischen Zeit*. E. Preuner, *Zwei Hydrophoren*. A discussion of two inscriptions, one of which is Kaibel's *Epigr. Gr.* 872. W. Schubart, *Aus einer Apollon-Aretalogie*. Berlin Papyrus 11517 contains on the back of an account a literary text. This is concerned with Delphi, and seems to be a romance written to advertise the merits of the oracle in an age of unbelief. Several emendations in S.'s text are due to J. U. Powell and H. I. Bell. A. Mentz, *Die Handschrift C von Iustins Epitome*. E. Howald, *Die Schriftenverzeichnisse des Aristoteles und des Theophrast*. MISCELLANEOUS: W. Otto, *Χρηματιστικὸς πύλων* in *Polyb.* 15. 31. 2 is the name of a wing of the palace at Alexandria.

Journal of Philology. 1919.

R. Gardner, *The Siege of Praeneste*. Discusses (with map) the blocking of the $\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}$ by Sulla. E. G. Hardy, *On the Lex Iulia Municipalis*. Defends his article in *J.R.S.* IV. 1 against the criticisms of Professor J. S. Reid. Clara M. Knight, *The Change from the Ancient to the Modern Greek Accent*. The change began in the pronunciation of Greek by foreigners, and developed in the period from Alexander the Great to the second century A.D. Arthur Platt, (i.) *Apollonius III.*, (ii.) *Aeschylea*. Textual criticisms. Joseph E. Gillett, *The Catharsis-clause in German Criticism before Lessing*. Discusses the views of Joachim Camerarius (1534), Melanchthon, Joh. Schosser, Jonas Bitner, Pontanus, Alexander Donatus (1631), etc. G. B. Bidder,

Arcus. The Homeric A. Farquharson himself vig papers com

Mnem.

P. H.

and on Luc the text of F. Muller, or 'spring,' (originally 'spurius, pro ropes.' By worship by Delator Am cannot be longer be fe Anaxagorea, in the writi Anaxagoras Classe, pp. 1 M. Engers, Nomarchs carried on royal secret officials. T royal doma They had o By the seco On Plato Ap ων καὶ προση ἰπὸ τοῦ θάττ From one third centu goddess H scripserit arg Meno and th it. M. Val thorex was p was the 'tu very early bronze, and long or sho list of the Phillimore clarigationem his article o

XLVI.

J. J. H new touche mark upon

Arcus. The word *arcus* in Horace C. III. 26-7, means 'bow-drills.' A. Platt, *Some Homeric Aorist Participles*. On aorist participles without past meaning. A. S. L. Farquharson, *Emendations of Marcus Aurelius' Commentaries*. S. G. Owen defends himself vigorously against criticisms by Professor Housman, and several shorter papers complete the volume.

Mnemosyne. XLVII. 2.

P. H. Damsté contributes critical notes on Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *Oedipus*, and on Lucian (these last continued from XLIV. p. 212). Ch. Charitonides emends the text of an epigram published by Arbanitopoulos in his *Θεσσαλικά Μνημεία*, p. 123. F. Muller, *De Vocibus Etruscis*, Tul, Spural, Naper, Ten-, argues that *tul* meant 'well' or 'spring,' connecting with it the Latin *tolleno* (more correctly spelt *toleno*), *Tulliamum* (originally 'well-house') and *Tullius*. *Spural* = 'public,' from which is derived Latin *spurius*, properly 'son of a *meretrix*.' From *naper* comes Latin *naputae*, 'measuring ropes.' From the root *ten-* was formed the name of a god or goddess, traces of whose worship by means of *sortes* survived at Praeneste. J. van Wageningen, *Magni Delator Amici* (Juv. I. 34), thinks that the personage referred to is Heliodorus. It cannot be Egnatius Celer, who, having been condemned under Vespasian, could no longer be feared by other *delatores* in the reign of Domitian. K. Kuiper, *De Mente Anaxagorea*, examines the fragments of Anaxagoras and the references to his doctrine in the writings of later philosophers, and concludes that Heinz, *Ueber den Noûs des Anaxagoras* (*Leipsiger Berichten der K. Ges. d. Wissenschaften* 1890: *Phil.-Hist. Classe*, pp. 1-45) is correct in the view that A. regarded his *voûs* as entirely incorporeal. M. Engers, *Observations on the Administration of Egypt under the Lagidae*, deals with the Nomarchs and their functions. Under Alexander they were native magistrates who carried on the civil administration of their districts. In the third century we find royal secretaries associated with them, by the second they have become subordinate officials. Their special function was the collection of taxes, at any rate from the royal domains, which supplied the greater part of the revenue of the kingdom. They had oversight of the cultivation of these domains and of the irrigation system. By the second century they had been reduced into mere tax-collectors. I. Berlage, *On Plato Ap.* p. 39., B. proposes to read *νέοι* for *δεινοί* in the passage *ἐγὼ μὲν ἄτε βραδύς ὢν καὶ πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ τοῦ βραδυτέρου ἐάλων, οἱ δὲ ἐμοὶ κατήγοροι ἄτε δεινοὶ καὶ ὀφείεις ὄντες ὑπὸ τοῦ θάπτονος*. W. Vollgraff continues his *New Argive Inscriptions* (from XLIV. p. 238). From one of these we learn that Chalcis possessed the title 'Ἀντιγορεία in the third century B.C., and from another that in the fifth there was a cult of the Cretan goddess Hellotis at Argos. H. D. Verdam, *Qua Aetate Plato Theaetetus Dialogum scripserit* argues from P.'s treatment of his subject that the *Theaetetus* came before the *Meno* and the *Phaedo*, while there is no reason to assume that the *Republic* is later than it. M. Valetton, *On the Signification of Θῶρηξ in Homer*, concludes that (1) the bronze *thorax* was probably unknown in the Homeric age, (2) the usual dress of the warrior was the 'tunica bellica': where even this is absent the passage is to be referred to very early sources, (3) the 'tunica bellica' was generally protected with plates of bronze, and (4) generally (if not always) worn on the naked body, (5) tunics were long or short; the presence of a *ζῶμα* or *μίτρα* implies a short tunic. V. appends a list of the passages where the *θῶρηξ* is mentioned. There are notes by J. S. Phillimore on Catullus I., and by M. M. Assman, *De Testatione triginta diebus post clarigationem facta, and a corollarium* by W. Vollgraff correcting certain statements in his article on an ancient inscription published in the last number.

XLVII. 3. 1919.

J. J. Hartman, *Paradoxa Tacitea*, seeks to show that Tacitus habitually added new touches to his work before publishing, and that these additions have left their mark upon his writings. He gives four instances: (i.) The *Agricola*, which, originally

written as a treatise on Britain corresponding to the *Germania*, was hastily transformed into the biography which we possess. H. argues at length that the *Germania* was composed not after the *Agricola*, as is generally believed, but slightly before it. The *Germania* is a model of perspicuous order; the arrangement of the *Agricola* has been somewhat obscured by the insertion of biographical matter. (ii.) The reference in *Ann.* I. 5 to the death of Fabius Maximus. (iii.) The account of the relations of Nero, Poppaea, and Otho (*Ann.* XIII. 45-47). (iv.) The narrative of Nero's proceedings after the fire at Rome. Here H. regards the references to the Christians as a later insertion of Tacitus. W. Vollgraff continues his *Novae Inscriptiones Argivae*. The present instalment contains: (i.) A catalogue of actors who took part in musical performances (first or second century B.C.). (ii.) An inscription in honour of a tragic actor (second or third century, A.D.). (iii.) One in honour of Cn. Pompeius Magnus, which contains the words *αὐτοκράτορα τὸ τέταρτον*, and is therefore to be dated circ. 63 B.C. (iv.) A letter from Agrippa to the senate of the Argives, to be dated between 23 and 13 B.C. and of interest as confirming the statement of Josephus (XV. 350) that Agrippa was appointed *τῶν πέραν Ἰονίου διάδοχος Καίσαρι*, as against Dio Cassius, who (LIII. 32, 1) confined his governorship to Syria. Vollgraff contributes corrections of two funeral inscriptions published in *Amer. Journal of Arch.* 1913, pp. 170, 185. P. H. Damsté contributes notes on the text of the tragedy *Octavia*; also on Aulus Gellius I.-V. C. Brakman, *Plantina*, discusses the dates of the *Poenulus* and *Truculentus*, which he assigns to 187 and 186 B.C. He adds some notes on the text of these plays and the *Persa*. P. Groeneboom, *Varia*, has notes on Plato's *Apology*. His explanation of the famous passage about buying the opinions of Anaxagoras ἐκ τῆς ὀρχήστρας, is that copies of tragedies or comedies could be bought, as appears from *Ar. Frogs* 1113. K. Kuiper, *Embaros*. Pausanias in *Eustath.* on *Il.* II. 732, p. 331, gives an account of this personage who is connected with the rites of Brauronian Artemis. This account has led K. to emend a sentence in Bekker, *Anecdota* 444. 32 (relating to a sacrifice performed by Embaros) as follows: τοῦ δὲ ἀμεμπτον τεύεσθαι (MS. τὸν δὲ ἀνειπόντα θύσαι) καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οὕτω ποιητέον (MS. ποιεῖν) φήσαντος. J. S. Phillimore, *De duobus locis Catullianis*, proposes to read in LXIV. 218 'quandoquidem fortuna mea ac tua, fervide, virtus,' and the first line of LXXI. 'si quoi scortorum viro bonus obstitit hircus,' understanding *viro bonus = virosus*. K. Kuiper has textual notes on *Vita Homer*; C. Brakman, J.F., on *Julius Valerius*; J. J. Hartman on *Theocritus*. J. J. H. also has brief notes on *Cic. Or.* § 146; *Ovid Tr.* V. 3. 47, *Ex. P.* IV. 12. 50; and *Seneca De Vita Beata* c. 24.

Musée Belge. I. 1920.

A. Delatte, *La chronologie pythagoricienne de Timée*. The table of succession as given in Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.*, agrees with the history of the persecutions as given by Apollonius. Timaeus is the source of both. A. Carnoy, *Le nom de Cronos*. We must compare Celtic *Cera*, Italian *Cerus-Ceres*: the root is that of *creo cresco*. Cronos is the primitive god of production and fertility. J. Misson, *Libanios et Livinus Ammonius*. An account of an old book (1522) containing three declamations attributed to Libanios, and annotated by the Flemish scholar Liévin van der Maude (born 1485). The book has probably perished in the fire of Louvain. E. Remy, *Sur une application de la morale stoïcienne au ius belli*. Cicero's treatment in the *De Officiis* is an effort to restrain Roman militarism, i.e. the dogma that 'all is lawful in war.' J. P. Walzing, (i.) *Tertullien et Salvien*. Shows that Saluianus (circa 450) in his *De gubernatione Dei* borrowed largely from Tertullian; (ii.) *La langue de Tertullien*. *Probus* means 'modest,' 'sweet-tempered'; *vera religio*, 'a sincere religious temper.' These examples point out a rich field of study for young Latinists. L. Laurand, *Les clausules latines*. A review of the contributions of Francesco di Capua, mostly appearing in the *Bolletino di Filologia classica*, and tracing the history of the *clausulae* through the middle ages.

Revue

M. Bes
sur Aristoph
vaî Πρωεραί
Properce III.
'As for thee
command ca
which Marce
passage refle
carried by th
Acheron, etc
μέρος (Aesch
Studies in Ea
Ritual, 1917

Rheinis

L. Wen
origin a part
whose chief
Parthenios;
and Apollon
sacrifice, a f
the Heraea,
with the T
fragments of
the end of f
belong to so
Argues again
Zur Biograph
the different
Arvalakten-F
(Petr. 66) an
geschichte (se
Silu. V. 3. 1
of Cybele.
II. see LXX
Arnobius' ar
tradition, ar
different sec
unbekannter
p. 248). W.
discusses rit
In a charm
invocation.

LXXII.

E. Fra
passages in
of writers, w
in iambics, e
of military d
period and c
on text of I

Revue de Philologie. XLIV. 1. 1920.

M. Besnier, *Récents travaux sur les Defixionum tabellae latinae*. L. Bayard, *Note sur Aristophane*. In *Birds* 1615 $\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\iota\sigma\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\upsilon$ is the Triballian's mispronunciation of $\nu\alpha\iota$ Πειρεταίρε. B. Hausoullier, *Inscriptions de Didymes*. F. Cumont, *A propos de Properce III. 18. 31 et de Pythagore*. Would keep the traditional text and translate, 'As for thee, mariner, who ferriest pious souls across the Styx, may the winds at thy command carry on high the $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\nu$ (*corpus inane*) of Marcellus, following the road by which Marcellus and Caesar, quitting the path of man, withdrew to heaven.' The passage reflects the Pythagorean doctrine, according to which the soul after death is carried by the winds to the sphere of the moon. According to this theology Styx, Acheron, etc., are in the upper air and not below the earth. J. E. Harry, *Πασσαλευμένος* (Aesch. P.V. 113). Would read $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ εἰλεόμενος. Reviews of W. Dennison, *Studies in East Christian and Roman Art*, 1918. Mary E. Armstrong, *Colours in Roman Ritual*, 1917.

Rheinisches Museum. LXXII. 1. 1917.

L. Weniger, *Vom Ursprung der olympischen Spiele*. The Olympian Agon is in origin a part of the worship of Zeus brought in by the Eleans despite the Pisatans whose chief deity was Hera. The Heraea is an older festival celebrated in Parthenios; the later Olympian festival is forced to alternate the months Parthenios and Apollonios. The oldest form of the Olympian celebration consisted only of a sacrifice, a footrace in the Stadion and a feast. The race for girls is an imitation of the Heraea, and in that festival is to be connected with the worship of Dionysus and with the Thyiads. O. Hense, *Chares und Verwandtes*. Restorations of papyrus fragments of Chares (see Gerhard *SB. d. Heid. Akad.* 1912). Chares' date is about the end of fourth or beginning of third century B.C. Verses in Stob. III. 20. 35 belong to some such writer of gnomic iambics. F. Boll, *Zu Demetrius de Elocutione*. Argues against late date based on supposed use of Apion and Strabo. H. Schenkl, *Zur Biographie des Rhetors Himerios*, discusses attribution of references in Libanius to the different persons named Himerios. W. Heraeus, *Zu Petronius und den neuen Arvalakten-Fragmenten*. Evidence of Arval records of 240 A.D. for words *sangunculum* (Petr. 66) and *facinus* in sense of *farcimen*. E. Bickel, *Beiträge zur römischen Religionsgeschichte* (see LXXI. p. 548). II. *Zum Cybelekult*. The passage *cur Phrygii* (Stat. *Silu.* V. 3. 176 sqq.) connects the head covering of the *Flamen* with that of the Priest of Cybele. W. Kroll, *Arnobiusstudien*. Notes on Books III.-VII. (for Books I. and II. see LXXI. p. 309) mainly concerned with the sources and the arrangement of Arnobius' arguments. W. Schmidt, *Die sogenannte Aristidesrhetorik*, discusses MS. tradition, arrangement and interrelation of Books I. and II., and relation of the different sections of the whole to Hermogenes. MISZELLEN: H. Mutschmann, *Ein unbekannter Mythograph*, namely the Gorgos of the Notion epitaph (*Ath. Mitt.* XI. p. 248). W. Meyer-Lübke, explains form of *manciola*, *manuciolum*, *peciolus*. C. Clemen discusses ritual of Semnones in Tacit. *Germ.* 39. K. Preisendanz, *κατά τινα καιρόν*. In a charm (Pap. Leid. J. 384) these words are only a rubric, and not part of invocation.

LXXII. 2. 1918.

E. Fraenkel, *Lyrische Daktylen* I. Elaborate discussion of purely dactylic passages in lyric. The 'double-dimeter' appears as metrical unit in a limited group of writers, while the dimeter in the great mass of dactylic lyric is not the base as it is in iambics, etc. B. A. Müller, *Zu Ninosroman*. Suggestions for text and discussion of military details in the battle. The date must lie between the end of the Hellenistic period and c. 50 A.D. W. Bannier, *Zu griechischen und lateinischen Autoren* I. Notes on text of Hesiod *Works and Days* 25-6, 35-42, *Scut. Her.* 144, *Homer Il.* II. 645,

Xen. *Mem.* II. 1, § 30, Lysias XIX. 23. Epigr. 39 in Aristotle *Fragm.* p. 402 Rose. Seneca *Phaedr.* 558. The papyrus fragment published in *SB. d. Heid. Akad.* 1914, 2 p. 25 ff. gives the opening of a dialogue: argues for form ἀγνώστω θεῷ as inscription of the altar at Athens. Proposes to read *Temphyra* for MSS. *Tymphala* in Lucr. V. 30 instead of usual emendation *Stymphala*. W. Schmid, *Die sogenannte Aristidesrhetorik* (continued from LXXII. 1). Book I. with its appendix cannot be by Aristides. Book II. is by yet another hand. Book I. is based on the rhetorical criticism of Demosthenes, and was used by Hermogenes. U. Kahrstedt, *Zwei Beiträge zur älteren römischen Geschichte. I. Die Patrizier und die Tributkomitien*. The generally accepted theory that there existed (beside the *Concilium Plebis*) *Comitia Tributa* in which both patricians and plebeians voted is not supported by ancient tradition. The legally recognized right of the *Concilium Plebis* to fine patricians is not earlier than the *Lex Hortensia*. The *Comitiatus maximus* in the XII. Tables is the *Comitia Curiata* as distinct from the separate *curiae*. II. *Chronologisches aus dem fünften und vierten Jahrhundert*. Discusses dates derived from Greeks and earlier Roman annalists. In the fifth century the date for the XII. Tables is not more than ten years out; the traditional date for the fall of the Tarquins may be approximately correct. A very acute and valuable discussion. G. Helmreich, *Zu Marcellus De medicamentis*. Criticism of Niedermann's text (Leipzig, 1916). P. Cauer, *Plato's Menon und sein Verhältnis zu Protagoras und Gorgias*. Concludes that they were composed in the order *Protagoras-Meno-Gorgias*. Gomperz and Pohlenz are wrong in regarding the *Meno* as a 'palinode' of the *Gorgias*. MISZELLEN: P. von der Mühl takes γένος οἷός ἐστι μαθὼν in Pind. *Pyth.* II. 72 'show thyself as thou truly art by understanding aright the meaning of my words.' P. Maas proposes to read <σκιάν> τὸ δὲ λεγόμενον δέδοικας in Ox. Pap. II. 215, col. II. 12. Th. Birt, *Verlag und Schriftstellereinnahmen im Altertum*. Interesting collection of passages on this topic.

Rivista di Filologia. XLVII. 3 and 4. July-October, 1919.

E. Lattes, *The latest Doubts about the Etruscan Affinities of the Two Pre-Hellenic Inscriptions of Lemnos*. Attacks the statements of Pareti (XLVI. 2; see *Class. Quart.* January, 1920). M. L. De Gubernatis, *Studies in Greek and Latin Accent*. Combats Crusius' law with regard to the dependence of ancient music on the word-accent. R. Sabbadini, *The Interpolated Text of the Ludus of Seneca*. The interpolations which are given in all editions up to (and including) that of Haase (1851) are derived, not from a MS. but from a printed text, the dedication of which bears the date 1513. This very rare edition (only one copy was known to Buecheler; there is another in the Vatican Library) is the source of Beatus Rhenanus' editions. Incidentally, two notes of Beatus Rhenanus show that the discovery of Velleius Paterculus took place near the beginning of the year 1515, if not earlier, and they confirm the opinion of Ellis, that Amerbach's transcript of the Murbach codex was not the same as that of Beatus' *amicus quidam*. M. L. De Gubernatis, *Tener Vaccula*. Supports the reading *tener* (taken as fem.) in *Priap. Catalept.* II. 9. F. Garin, *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon in Oxyrh. Papyrus 1250*. E. Cocchia, *The Relation which according to Photius exists between Lucius of Patrae and Lucian*. Maintains the identity of Lucian's 'Lucius of Patrae' with Apuleius. The Μεταμορφώσεις λόγοι διάφοροι referred to by Photius (*Bibl.* 129 init.) were a first edition written by Apuleius in Greek. This is consistent with the words of Photius (μόνον οὐ = οὐδαμῶς, a use attested by Hesychius). A. Beltrami, *Clement of Alexandria in the Octavius of Minucius Felix* (to be continued). Seeks to show by means of parallel passages and other arguments that Min. Fel. is largely indebted to Clement. G. Funaioli, *Note on Virgil*. The opening lines of *Ec.* VI. do not say that Virgil wrote of 'kings and battles' before turning to pastoral poetry. The statement of Donatus-Suetonius is

probably
Aurelius V
analogy a
Walde and
E. Bignon
2, 4, 5, 9
Oxyrhynch
establishm
Oxyrhynch

Woch

Feb.
of 'schwa
L. Nachm
E. Löfste
Mar.
(Lehner).
byzantine
Mar.
Alexandri
die Haupt
G. Frank
Greek au
Mar.
relation o
(Manitius
predecess
Apr.
Generally
(Wartenb
Görlitz;
Apr.
with accu
Die antike
readings
May
tionen (G
standpoin
etymologi
June
Ille ego (N
the lines.
July
several re

Glott

A. M
study of
(‘powder
place of
φελούκα

probably based on a false interpretation of the passage. F. Stabili, (1) *Notes on Aurelius Victor*, (2) *The Etymology of Vinolentus*. Morphology, semasiology and analogy are all against the derivation from *uinum* and *olens*, which is adopted by Walde and many others. G. Giri, *Proteus and Cyrene in Virgil's Legend of Aristaeus*. E. Bignone, (1) *Philodemea* (Pap. Herc. ined. 168, col. 1, 2; Pap. Herc. 57, col. 1, 2, 4, 5, 9); (2) *New Researches in Lucretius' Prooemium*. F. Garin, *Theocritus in Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* 1618. The papyrus contributes practically nothing to the establishment of the text. Obituary: Pietro Rasi (De Gubernatis). Reviews: *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XIII. etc.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1920.

Feb. 16. H. Güntert, *Indogermanische Ablautprobleme* (Wagner). Shows existence of 'schwa secundum,' the weak grade of *ā*, *ē*, *ō* in connexion with any consonant. L. Nachmanson, *Erotianstudien* (Fuchs). Explanatory to author's edition of Erotianus. E. Löfstedt, *Tertullians Apologeticum* (Koch).

Mar. 1. H. Knorr, *Töpfer und Fabriken verzierter Terra sigillata des I Jahrhunderts* (Lehner). Deals specially with south Gaulish ware. D. C. Hesseling, *L'Achilleïde byzantine* (Wartenberg).

Mar. 15. R. Pagenstecher, *Alexandrinische Studien* (Fiechter). Essays on Alexandrine art, including the origin of Pompeian wall-decorations. F. Schöll, *Ueber die Haupthandschrift von Ciceros Philippiken* (Busche). Full information as to MS. V. G. Franke, *Quaestiones Agathianae* (Widmann). Examines A.'s imitation of standard Greek authors.

Mar. 29. H. Meyer, *Aristotelische Ethik*, etc. (Nestle). Essays elucidating the relation of A. to Plato's thought. A. E. Housman, *Manilii Astronomicon Liber III.* (Manitius). The edition of this book shows the same admirable qualities as its predecessors.

Apr. 12. H. Fischl, *Ergebnisse und Aussichten der Homer-analyse* (Stürmer). Generally convincing. A. Heisenberg, *Dialekte und Umgangssprache im Neugriechischen* (Wartenberg). The material was collected from the 4th Greek army corps at Görlicz; especially important are specimens of the dialect of Samothrace.

Apr. 26. G. Veith, *Die Feldzüge des Oktavianus in Illyrien* (Judeich). Discusses with accurate detail O.'s campaigns against the Iapydes and Dalmatians. H. Lehner, *Die antiken Steindenkmäler des Provinzialmuseums in Bonn* (Ziehen). Often improves on readings of C.I.L.

May 17. K. Brugmann, *Satzgestaltung nach Massgabe der seelischen Grundfunktionen* (Güntert). The syntactic material of I.-E. languages is examined from the standpoint of psychology, and living speech used to explain dead languages. New etymologies of *Σάτυρος*, *Τίτυρος*, etc.

June 7. A. Kocevalov, *De μέλλειν verbi constructione* (Sitzler). J. S. Phillimore, *Ille ego* (Nohl). The author defends, and the reviewer disputes the authenticity of the lines.

July 5. J. Hilberg, *Hieronymi Epistulae III.* (Weymann). The reviewer adds several references and notes.

LANGUAGE.

Glotta. X. 1, 2. 1919.

A. Maidhof, *Rückwanderer aus den islamitischen Sprachen im Neugriechischen*. A study of words that have come back to their old home in Greece; e.g. τὸ μπαρούτι ('powder'), borrowed by the Greeks from Turkish (Persian, Arabic), has taken the place of its ancestor πυρίτις (πυρίτης), which still lives in puristic Modern Greek. φελοῦκα ('ship') borrowed from Ital. *feluca*, Arab. *folk*, which comes from ἐφόλιον.

H. Sjögren discusses the word-order of possessive adjectives in such expressions as *tua Bromia ancilla* (Plaut. *Amph.* 1077). H. Blase contributes the first instalment of an article on the Latin subjunctive, dealing with the jussive pluperfect (*ne poposcisses*). P. Kretschmer continues his essay on names in Greek myths. Τριτογένεια owes the length of its first vowel to metrical convenience and has no connexion with Τρίτων, Τριτωνίς λίμνη. He brings the word into relation with the Τριτοπάτορες, to whom the Athenians prayed for offspring. Τρίτος = γνήσιος; Athena is the 'true daughter of Zeus.' Τριτοπάτωρ = 'great-grandfather,' then 'head of the family'; on it was modelled τριτογενής 'true child of the γένος,' cf. *pronepos* formed from *proavus*, grandson from grandfather; French more logically has *petit-fils*. Ἀργεῖφόντης. K. upholds the old explanation ('slayer of Argos'), Ἀργεῖ—and not Ἀργο—for metrical ease like ἀνδρεῖφόντης (*Il.* 2. 651) for ἀνδρο-. Κένταυροι 'water-beaters' (αὔρα 'water'), a male counterpart of the nymph Πληξάιρη, cf. *Crenaëus*, the name of a Centaur in Ovid *Met.* 12. 313. G. Wolterstorff traces the development of the definite article from *ille* with special reference to the anticipation of it in classical Latin. P. Kretschmer derives the Greek aorist imperative from a gerundive in -σον, still seen in οἶσθ' ὁ δρᾶσον and the like. W. Kroll deals with the Latin subjunctive and future as well as with questions of word-order.

X. 3. 1919.

E. Hermann writes on the Homeric use of the imperfect tense in negations, e.g. ὥς φάσαν, ἀλλ' οὐ πείθον, *Od.* 9. 500. P. Kretschmer supports the connexion of *quivites* and *quivitare* ('to call the citizens,' 'shout'), and discusses Oscan *egmo*, τσέτονλα = *scheda*, *putare*. U. Leo studies the vocabulary of Plautus, viz. *claudere*, *concludere*, etc.; *cedere*, *concedere*; *evenire*; compounds of -ob and sub-. E. Kieckers illustrates 'pleonastic inquit' with copious parallels from ancient and modern languages.

X. 4. 1920.

This number contains summaries of work published in 1916, including magazine articles; the collection of suggested derivations is particularly useful and interesting; γαστήρ (acc. to Prellwitz) = γραστήρ, by dissimilation, cf. γράω [Callim. fr. 200], Skt. *grastar*. γέφυρα (Prell.) is a reduplication from *bher-*, and means 'the bearer.' *Pro-mittere* (Reeb) gets its sense of 'promise' from *manum promittere* 'to shake hands over a bargain.'

Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. XXI. 1-5. 1919-20.

Nadine Stchoupak, *Le Complément du Nom dans le Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. The relation of one noun to another is expressed (1) by case-forms, (2) by derivative adjectives, (3) by composition. Sanskrit shows a development from (1) to (2) and from (2) to (3). J. Vendryes, *Etymologies*: 1. Lat. *mentula*, Skr. *mānthati*; 2. Lat. *nux* (I.E. *knud-* > Lat. *knuk-* > *gnuk-* > *nuk-*); 3. Lat. *salebra* (Ir. *sal* 'dirt' O.H.G. *salo*, *sal(a)wēr* 'sallow'); 4. Fr. *bief* and the river name *Bief* (*Biez*) from Celtic *bedo-* (Welsh *bedd* 'ditch,' cf. Lat. *fodio*, etc.). A. Meillet shows that the original I.E. words for *son*, *daughter*, and *child* (especially *son*) were dropped in many languages through religious fear of naming that which one valued highly. Hence the existing variety of new words to express these ideas. Meillet argues that the zero vowel-grade of Skr. *bhūrjaḥ* is imported from some unattested derivative form (cf. Lith. *biržlis*, etc.), where it was due to the addition of a suffix. V. Magnien studies the dialect of Theocr. XV. in detail, and concludes that it is essentially the same as the literary Syracusan of Epicharmus, Sophron, the Pythagoreans, etc. Meillet discusses the cases in which a labiovelar became delabialized in Greek instead of becoming π (β, φ). The change of *k^we* (through *k'e*) to *te-* is earlier than the change of *k^w* to π. Delabialization occurred (1) in case of doubling (*ikkos*, etc.), (2) before *e* vowels: The

κ of κῶς, κ
supported b
neighbourin
Meillet, has
non-themat
and κομίζ-
Romance l
166-186) A
of Latin v
towards i a
ceteris parib
a dominatin
to the end
development
languages
becoming c
stress acce
accented sy
order to re
higher disa
responsible
other langu
of quantiti
μωθός (m.)
was a femi
'un système
words (e.g.
the correspo
ἀσῶ in the
vieux slave.
out of even
three is lon
form *vā* (Y
Etude sur l

Zeits

Aug.

by Γόργου

1. πέριξ:

Skt. *sūkṣm*

3. ἔθειρα

minnow.

δέατο < δ

E. W. Fa

supports t

agere. W

descendan

Griechische

2. πλίσσο

man, (i.)

ticipale of

Etymologie

δαιμόνων μ

κ of κῶς, κότε, Thess. κίς starts from the Gen. $k^w e(h)o > k'eo$ [$> \tau'eo$], where κ was supported by the n. pl. ($k^w ya >$) $k'ya > \sigma\sigma a$, Att. $\tau\tau a$. (3) Dissimilation from a neighbouring labial sometimes caused k^w to lose the w . Grk. $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}-\zeta\omega$, according to Meillet, has replaced the non-thematic present (Skr. $kṣéti$), and is formed from the non-thematic stem by the addition of the same ζ as is seen in Cypr. $\kappa α λ ή - \zeta \omega$, $\epsilon \rho \rho \acute{\iota} - \zeta \omega$ and $\kappa \omicron \mu \acute{\iota} - \zeta \omega$ (: $\kappa \omicron \mu \acute{\epsilon} \omega$, cf. the Lat. type $sōpīo sōpīs$) A.-C. Juret gives evidence from Romance languages for δ in Lat. *cognitus*. In a longer article (pp. 93-107 and 166-186) A.-C. Juret argues that the alteration of quality and even total loss of Latin vowels in syllables other than the first of a word is essentially a raising towards i and a sign of *shortening*, phoneticians having observed that high vowels are *ceteris paribus* shorter than low. The first syllable was never accented, but assumed a dominating rôle in respect of quantity, the others being shorter the nearer they were to the end of the word. The Latin accent was musical and did not affect the development of the unaccented vowels. A. Meillet generalizes the foregoing. In languages with a stress accent unaccented vowels are modified without necessarily becoming closed; they become neutral and indistinct. In languages with little or no stress accent (Modern Greek, Slavonic, Armenian, French), especially where the accented syllable is longer than the others, the unaccented and shorter vowels, in order to remain distinct, are raised towards i , and when they cannot be raised any higher disappear. A stress accent cannot be admitted for Latin. Quantity alone is responsible for the changes of the vowels in syllables other than the first. In some other languages a stress accent may have existed, but its rôle is masked by the effects of quantity. In a short article Meillet points out that the ancestor of Gk. $\mu\sigma\theta\acute{o}s$ (m), Ved. *mīdham*, Zend *mīdām* (n), Slav. *mīzda*, Goth. *mīzdo*, O.E. *meord* (f), was a feminine o stem. E. Destaing studies Berber verb-forms. A. Belić expounds 'un système accentologique du slave commun.' A. Meillet argues that certain Armenian words (e.g. *hin* 'old', *hum* 'raw') have acquired the initial h under the influence of the corresponding Iranian words. A. Meillet reads *ayāsčā* for the alleged dual form *āsčā* in the Avesta (inferior MSS. have *yāsčā*). Meillet, *Sur le Locatif de oko en vieux slave*. Meillet, *Sur le Rhythme quantitatif dans la Langue védique*. At least one out of every two consecutive syllables tends to be long. In Gk. one out of every three is long; contrast *bodhamānaḥ* with *πενθόμενος*, etc. Meillet identifies the Zend form *vā* (Y. XXIX. 5) as a dual (O.Slav. *vě*, Lith. *vè-du*, Goth. *wi-t*). M.-T. Féghali, *Etude sur les Emprunts syriaques dans les Parlers arabes du Liban*.

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. XLVII. 1, 2. 1915.

Aug. Zimmerman, *Nachtrag zu XLIV. 318 sq.*, Etymology of *amoemus* supported by Γόργουινος: Γοργώϊ, μινωινή: Μινώϊ. Jarl Charpentier, *Griechische Etymologien*. 1. $\pi \acute{\epsilon} \rho \delta \acute{\iota} \xi$: Skt. *prādāku* with stem *per-d-*, cf. $\pi \epsilon \rho - \kappa - \nu \acute{o} \varsigma$. 2. $\alpha \upsilon \chi \mu \acute{o} \varsigma < * \sigma \alpha \nu \kappa - \sigma \mu \acute{o}$, cf. Skt. *sūkṣma* 'thin.' $\alpha \nu \theta \acute{o} \varsigma < * \sigma \alpha \nu \sigma - \alpha$ shows that k and s are root determinatives. 3. $\epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha < * \alpha \theta \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha < \mu \eta \delta \eta - \epsilon \rho - \chi \acute{\alpha}$: $\iota \omicron \nu \theta \acute{\alpha} \varsigma$, O.Ir. *fēs*. 4. $\mu \alpha \acute{\iota} \nu \eta$, $\mu \alpha \acute{\iota} \nu \acute{\iota} \varsigma$: Skt. *mīnā-*, Eng. *minnow*. 5. $\alpha \mu \acute{\iota} \lambda \lambda \alpha < \alpha - \mu \acute{\iota} \lambda \lambda \alpha$: $\omicron \mu \acute{\iota} \lambda \nu \varsigma$, Skt. *mīlāti*, Lat. *miles*. 6. $\delta \epsilon \nu \delta \acute{\iota} \lambda \lambda \omega$: $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \omicron \varsigma$, $\delta \epsilon \alpha \tau \omicron < \delta \epsilon \iota$, Skt. *dīdēti*. 7. $\sigma \acute{\iota} \mu \beta \lambda \omicron \varsigma < * \tau \mu - \lambda \nu$: Skt. *pra-stīma* 'close-pressed.' E. W. Fay, *Apropos of Ztschr. XLV. 117*. Use of Lat. *agere* with *gemmas*, *florē*, supports theory that $\alpha \gamma \nu \omicron \varsigma$ and $\alpha \gamma \epsilon \nu$ in Latin plant names are derived from root of *agere*. W. Schulze, *Der Frühling als primum tempus*. French *printemps* is the lineal descendant of the *primo tempore* of Buecheler, *Carm. Epigr.* 967. W. Prellwitz, *Griechische Wörter gedeutet*. 1. $\epsilon \pi \acute{\iota} \nu \acute{\iota} \varsigma$ is related to Skt. *viśyati*, *veśdyati* 'hurt'. 2. $\pi \lambda \acute{\iota} \sigma \sigma \omicron \mu \alpha \iota$: Lith. *plėikiti* 'to cut open' of fish, Lett. *plītēt*, $\pi \lambda \acute{\iota} \nu \theta \omicron \varsigma$. Aug. Zimmerman, (i.) *Die Etymologie von secus*. Maintains that *secus* (: *Secuntilla*) is a present participle of *sequor*, but admits possibility of a second declension *secus*: *pedisecus*. (ii.) *Zur Etymologie von Larunda*. $-da$ is identical with first syllable of $\Delta \alpha - \mu \acute{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho$; *Larunda* $\delta \alpha \mu \acute{\omicron} \nu \omega \nu \mu \acute{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$, C. Gl. II. 121, 17 is therefore a literal translation.

XLVII. 3, 4. 1915.

H. Diels, *Etymologica*: 1. Πυραμίδες. The Egyptian structures so named from their resemblance to the wheaten cakes πυραμίδες. 2. Χυμεία. 3. Ἐντελέχεια implies ἐντελεχής; formed like ἐντελόμοσθος. 4. Ἀσβεστος is not our asbestos (Gk. ἀμιάντος) but calx niua (τίτανος). 5. Ἀσφαλτος rightly explained by Stephanus, with active meaning as ἀμέθοστος. Aug. Zimmerman, *Zum Suffix des lat. Participium Präsens*. Traces of the suffix -ont- in *gerentes, flexantes, Sequontilla*. G. Herbig, *Zur Vorgeschichte der römischen pontifices*. A defence of the old etymology of the word as 'bridge-(path)-maker.' W. Prellwitz, *Griechische Etymologica*: 1. ἀρχός. 2. ἀσέλγης < ἄ + σελγ, σαλγ: Lett. *tulsums* 'swelling.' 3. ἀφάκη: ἀφάσσω. 4. γαστήρ < *γραστήρ: γράω. 5. γέφυρα: root *bher*. 6. ἡπεδανός: Skt. *āpāna* and root of ποῖς, πέδον. 7. ἡπίος: Skt. *āpi* 'friend,' Lat. *āpio*. 8. ἡπάω, ἡπητής. 9. κλῆμα. 10. λώβη: Lith. *slogù, sloginti*, 'oppress.' 11. μίτος, ἀγνός. The former with μοῖτος, μῦτιος, Skt. *mithás*: the latter: O.N. *knútr*. F. Holthausen, *Etymologien*: 2. *iimeo*. 3. Lat. *vē-*, O.H.G. *wādal*. 4. Lat. *dē*, O.H.G. *zādal*. 6. Lat. *vārus*, Germ. *wōr*. 7. *tetricus*. 8. Lat. *stolo*. 9. *pīpinna*. 10. **neg-* in *negare, negotium* < **negi* = A.S. *nec*. 11. Lat. *mulleus*, O.H.G. *molm*. 12. *mīluos*. 13. *lēna, lacio*. 14. Lat. *iūilum*, M.E. *yowl*. 15. Lat. *is*, O.E. *ilca*. 16. Lat. *jānus*, M.H.G. *Jahn*. 17. Lat. *hirrīve*, M.H.G. *girren*. 18. Lat. *fūmus*, A.S. *dūnunga*. 19. *fēmīna, fleo, φληδάω*. 20. *egeo*. 21. *cūdo*. 22. *cucūrio*. 23. *frūstum*. 25. *formica*. 26. *cossus*. 28. *sūgillare*. 31. ἀνθρωπος.

XLVIII. 1, 2. 1917.

F. Hartmann, *Aorist und Imperfektum*. I. Ed. Hermann, *Zur lateinischen und romanischen Betonung*. Deals with the types *tenebrae, parietem, conuenit*. — *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax*: 1. *Zum Localis der Zeit*. 2. *Zum Ablativus instrumentalis*. 3. *Capitis damnare*. — *Italisches*: 1. *Lateinisch-ostisch proiectad*. 2. *Marsisch pacre*. P. Persson, *Zur lateinischen und griechischen Wortforschung*: 1. Lat. *arma* means not defensive armour but 'fittings' in general. 2. Lat. *disertus* < *dis-severe* implies clearness of expression. 3. Gr. ἐνὶ: the old etymology (: O.H.G. *wonēn* is right. 4. Lat. *littera* < *lītera* < **leitesā*: lino 'smear.' Lat. *vōrārii*: ἐρωή. 6. Lat. *uorsus, uersus*. 7. Lat. *uestigium, uestibulum*, both contain the prefix *ue-*. Aug. Zimmermann, *Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des carmen arvale*. — *Das lat. Suffix -ment(o)*, Gr. *ἡμα, ἡματος = Lat. *semen, sementis*. W. Prellwitz, Lat. *uitāre*, < *ui* 'apart' and the frequentative *itāre*, cf. *νίκη* < *νι-ικā*: Lat. *ico* (?). K. B. Erman, *Faliskisch efles*. Identified with Lat. *aedilis*.

XLVIII. 3, 4. 1918.

Emile Boisacq, *Grec ἔνοσις f. secousse*. Etymology supported by *δσις* and *πέσις*. W. S[chulze], *Ἑρῡον*. F. Holthausen, *Etymologisches*: 1. Germ. *pwītan*, Gr. *σίτος*. 2. O.E. *pyddan*, Lat. *tundo*. 3. L.G. *dūn*, Lat. *tumeo, teneo*. 4. O.E. *gōp*, Lat. *habeo*. 5. O.E. *næstan*, Gr. *νέικος*. 7. O.E. *bōian*, Lat. *fāri*. 9. Lat. *Libitina*, O.Sl. *libiŕь*. 10. Norw. *laft*, Gr. *λαπαρός*.

XLIX. 1, 2. 1919.

F. Hartmann, *Aorist und Imperfektum (Fortsetzung)*. H. Lattmann, *Negativ, Indefinitum, Intensivum und gr. μή*, deals with Lat. *-ne, an* (= Gr. *ān*), and the potential force of *nē* and *μή* with verbs of 'fearing.' F. Müller, *Zum lat. Präfix au-*. The prefix represents *ap(o)*. F. Bechtel, *Parerga*: 55. ἀνασώρολις. 56. πέλεθος. 57. σφαλός. 58. τριγύλη. W. Krause, *Zur Aussprache des θ im Gortynischen*. In the earlier period *θ = t*, in the latter *θ = p*. J. Pokorný, *Aes und Isarnon*. *Aes* connected with *Ayasya*, the old name of Cyprus.

ABSTRUSA
accent, L
in t
in t
Achilles T
adnotatiu
adnotatiu
Aeschylus
agricultur
Alban lak
Alfenus, 1
Anaxagor
Andros, 9
Apuleius'
of, 150
Aratus, 33
Aristoteli
Arnold (E
artillery,
Asklepiod
astronomi
97 f.
Augustus

Barker (E
82 ff.
Barriera,
196
' breues b
Browne, 1
Burnet (J

caesura, 1
Callimach
57 ff., 1
Candaule
Carthagin
case-endin
Castiglior
Catullus
160 ff.
Celtiberia
chronolog
Cicero: a
Cato
cov
his π
nec

INDICES

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- ABSTRUSA glossary, notes on, 87 ff., 186
 accent, Latin and Greek, 206, 209
 in the dactylic poets, 55
 in the metre of Plautus and Terence, 55
 Achilles Tatius, notes on, 147 ff.
 adnotatiunculae Plautinae, 49 ff.
 adnotatiuncula Plautina, 81
 Aeschylus, unlisted fragments, 195
 agriculture in early Latium, 199
 Alban lake, the *emissarium* of, 199
 Alfenus, 160 ff.
 Anaxagoras, his *νοῦς*, 203
 Andros, 93
 Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, the unique manuscript of, 150 ff.
 Aratus, 33
 Aristotelica, 16 ff.
 Arnold (E. V.), classics and citizenship, 78 ff.
 artillery, ancient, 82 ff.
 Asklepiodotus, the text, 195
 astronomical comments on the Julian calendar, 97 f.
 Augustus and his legionaries, 187 ff.
 Barker (E. Phillips), *παλιντρονον* and *εὐθρότρονον*, 82 ff.
 Barriera, A., discovery of MS. of *Cato Maior*, 196
 'breues breuiantes', 50, 81
 Browne, Henry, *Our Renaissance*, 79 ff.
 Burnet (John), *Vindiciae Platonicae* II. 132 ff.
 caesura, Homeric, 195
 Callimachus, the MSS. of the *Hymns*, 1 ff., 57 ff., 105 ff.
 Candaules, 195
 Carthaginians, the, 201
 case-endings, Indo-European, 195
 Castiglioni (L.), ad Tibulli *El.* I. 4. 41-44, 122
 Catullus and Horace on Sufenus and Alfenus, 160 ff.
 Celtiberians, the, 200
 chronology, Roman, 46 f.
 Cicero: and the *poetae noui*, 195
 Cato Maior, codex II. vetus Danielis recovered, 196
 his *παλινφῶδία* and questions therewith connected, 39
 Cicero: MS. V. of the *Philippics*, 207
 Ciris, the, 24
 citizenship, the achievement of Hellas, 79
 classics and citizenship, 78 ff.
 clauses of willed result, 199
 coinage, Rome's first, 55
 comitia tributa, 205
 Culex, 23 ff.
 its scene in Epirus, 30
 Curtius' debt to Arrian, 53
 Diagoras of Melos, 202
 Dionysos, miracle of the wine at his advent, 92 ff.
 Drachmann on prosaic words in the *Ciris*, 26
 dvandva compounds, Greek, 48
 in modern Greek, 186
 Egypt under the Lagidae, 203
 uninundated lands, 199
Elogium Duilianum, 199
 Embaros, 204
epistulae, 202
 Etruscans, their origin, 56
 Euripides, original plan of the *Medea*, 54
 his trochaic tetrameters, 174 f.
 Farnell (Lewis R.), Plato Comicus Fr. *Phaon* ii., 139 ff.
 †Fay (E. W.), Scipionic forgeries, 163 ff.
 Ferguson (A. S.), corrigenda on Plato's *Republic* 421B, 38
 Fort (J. A.), the *Peruigilium Veneris* and the Tiberiani *Amnis* in quatrains, 173 ff.
 forum of Augustus, 199 f.
 Fotheringham (J. K.), astronomical comments on Dr. T. Rice Holmes' note on the Julian calendar, 97 ff.
 Frank (Tenney), Vergil's *Res Romanae*, 156 ff.; Catullus and Horace on Sufenus and Alfenus, 160 ff.
 future participle in Latin, 53
 Gallus, Cornelius, 24
 Gaulish terracotta ware, 207
 Greek dvandva compounds, 48
 Greek gerundive in -σων, 208
 Greek world and India, 55
 Greenwood, L. H. G., on Aristotle *Nic. Eth.* vi. 13. 5, 20

- Groebe, Paul, his views on the first day of 709 A.V.C. criticized, 46 f.
 Gyges, 195
- †Hardie (W. R.), the *Culex*, 23 ff.
 Hardy (E. G.), Augustus and his legionaries, 187 ff.
 Heliodorus, 203
Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, authorship, 100
 Hesioda, miscellanea, 126 ff.
 Hittite an Indo-European language, 199
 Holmes (T. Rice), Cicero's *παλωφδία* and questions therewith connected, 39
 a supplementary note on the Julian calendar, 46
 astronomical comments on the note, 97 f.
 corrigendum to the note, 99
 earliest visible phase of the moon, 172
 Homerica, 123 ff.
- i* and *ei*, 167
 India and the Greek world, 55, 198
- Jackson, Miss G., on the *Culex*, 22 ff.
 Jews, why banished from Italy, 195
 Julian calendar, 46
 astronomical comments on, 97 ff.
 planned in Egypt, 98
 Juvenal, his banishment, 197
- Lenae, Lenaea, 92 ff.
lex Tappula, 165
liber glossarum, notes on, 87 ff.
 Liévin van der Maude, 204
 Lindsay (W. M.), adnotatiunculae Plautinae, 49 ff.
 Liralia, 164
 Lowe (E. A.), the unique manuscript of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (Laurentian. 68. 2) and its oldest transcript (Laurentian. 29. 2), 150 ff.
 'Lucius of Patrae' = Apuleius, 206
 Lucretius, his contribution to expression in Latin verse, 25 n.1
 Lumb (T. W.), notes on Achilles Tatius, 147 ff.
- Mackail, J. W., views on the *Culex* and *Moretum* criticized, 37
 Mavrogordato (John), modern Greek dvandva compounds, 186
 Mega Spilaeon, the convent, 200
 miracle of the wine at Dionysos' advent, 92 ff.
 miscellanea Hesioda, 126 ff.
 modern Greek dialects, 207
 modern Greek dvandva compounds, 186
 moon, its earliest visible phase, 97 ff., 172
Moretum of Suetius, 37
 Muller (H. C.), Greek dvandva compounds, 48
 music and word-accent, 206
 mutiny in the Roman army, 199
- Neoptolemus, his doctrines restored, 54
 nomarchs, 203
 Numantia, 200
- Octavian's campaigns in Illyria, 207
 Olympian games, 205 f.
ou, archaism for *u*, 167
 Ovid's third wife, 197
- παλιντρον* and *εὐθρότρον*, 82 ff.
 past jussive, 208
Pervigilium Veneris, the, 173 ff.
 Phaon, his story, 139 ff.
 Phillimore, J. S., views on the *Culex* criticized, 37 f.
 Plato, corrigenda on *Republic* 421B, 38
 date of *Theaetetus*, 203
 Plato Comicus, Fr. Phaon ii.: a parody of Attic ritual, 139 ff.
 Platt (Arthur), Homeric, 123 ff.
 Plantus, adnotatiunculae, 49 ff.
 adnotatiuncula, 81
 dates of *Poenulus* and *Truculentus*, 204
poetae novi, the, 195
 Pompeian wall-decorations, 207
 present participle, the Latin suffix of, 210
primum tempus, 209
 principate of Pompeius, 100
- r* for *rr* in inscriptions, 167
 rescripts, 202
- Saluianus, 204
 'schwa secundum', 207
 Scipionic forgeries, 163 ff.
 Seneca, the *Ludus*, 206
 Shackle (E. J.), note on the Abstrusa glossary, 186
 Sicily, agriculture and taxation, 200
 Smiley (M. T.), the MSS. of Callimachus' *Hymns*, 1 ff., 57 ff., 105 ff.
 Smith (J. A.), Aristotelica, 16 ff.
 Sonnenschein (E. A.), adnotatiuncula Plautina, 81
 Stewart, Professor J. A., on *μετὰ λόγον* and *κατὰ λόγον*, 19 ff.
 subjunctive in Latin, 208
subscriptions, 202
 Suetonius, 160 ff.
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 53 ff., 100 ff., 195 ff.
 American Journal of Philology, 53, 195 f.
 Athenaeum (Pavia), 196
 Berliner philologische Wochenschrift, 53 ff., 100 f., 197 f.
 Classical Philology, 55 f., 198 f.
 Classical Weekly, 101 f., 199 f.
 Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 200
 Glotta, 207 f.
 Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 200 ff.
 Hermes, 202
 Journal of Philology, 202
 Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, 208 f.
 Mnemosyne, 102 f., 203 f.
 Musée Belge, 204
 Revue de Philologie, 56, 103, 205
 Rheinisches Museum, 205 f.

SUMMARIES

Rivis
 Woc
 102
 Zeis
 sch
 Syntax and

Tacitus, the
 Teos, 94
 Tertullian's
 θ, pronounci
 Thomson (E
 and the L
 Thucydides
 his sp
 Tiberiani A

Achilles Ta
 i. 8 (2)
 ii. 19 (1)
 38 (2)
 24 (3)
 11 (3)
 v. 6

Aeschylus:
Prom. I

Alcaeus:—
 Fr. 1 (C)

Alexander A
de Anim
in Lib.

Aristophane
Birds (1)
Cleuds (3)
Frogs (1)

Aristoteles:
de Incess
de Virt.

Eth. Ni
 17 f.
 Mag. M

Prob. v.
Rhet. iii

Athenaeus:
 vii. (282)

Auctor ad H
 iv. (22)

Caesar:—
Bell. Ga

Callimachus:
 ii. (54)

Catullus:—
 (14) 161

lxxi. (6)
 Charisius (8)
 i. (112,

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS—continued:

- Rivista di Filologia, 56, 103 f., 206 f.
 Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie,
 104, 207
 Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachfor-
 schung, 209 f.
 Syntax and psychology, 207
 Tacitus, the *Agricola* and *Germania*, 203 f.
 Teos, 94
 Tertullian's language, 204
 θ, pronunciation of, 210
 Thomson (H. J.), notes on the Abstrusa glossary
 and the *Liber glossarum*, 87 ff.
 Thucydides, division into thirteen books, 199
 his speeches, 197
 Tiberiani *Annis*, the, 184 f.

Tiberius in Tacitus, 195
tunica bellica, 203

- Velletri, 199
 Verdun, excavations near, 53
 Vindiciae Platonicae II., 132 ff.
 Virgil, *Catalepton* IX., 198 f.
Ciris, 199
Culex, 23 ff., 198
 his Epicureanism, 195, 199
 'ille ego' (preface to the *Aeneid*), 207
 Värtheim (J.), the miracle of the wine at
 Dionysos' advent, 92 ff.
 White (H. G. Evelyn), miscellanea Hesiodica,
 126 ff.
 womanhood in the late Roman republic, 196

II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

Achilles Tatius:—

- i. 8 (2) 147
 ii. 19 (1, 6), 36 (1) 147; 36 (3), 147 f., 37 (3),
 38 (2) 148; iii. 7 (1), 15 (3), 21 (3, 6),
 24 (3) 148; iv. 4 (5), 148, 7 (7), 10 (2),
 11 (3, 4), 14 (2, 6), 17 (1), 19 (4) 149;
 v. 6 (3) 149; viii. 6 (7), 7 (1), 10 (9) 149

Aeschylus:—

Prom. Vinct. (113) 205

Alcaeus:—

Fr. 1 (Oxyrh. Pap. X. 1233) 131

Alexander Aphrodisiensis:—

- de Anima*, 127 (20) 17, 169 (17) 17
in Lib. de Sensu, 147 (18), 17

Aristophanes:—

- Birds* (1615) 205
Clouds (25) 19, (537 sqq.) 199
Frogs (1113) 204

Aristoteles:—

- de Incessu*, iii. (705a) 18
de Virt. et Vit. v. (6) 18
Eth. Nic. iii. 1 (16) 16, (17) 17 f.; iv. 3 (15)
 17 f.; v. 5 (13) 16; vi. 13 (5) 20
Mag. Mor. ii. (6) 17
Prob. v. (8 881b) 18
Rhet. iii. (11 1412a sqq.) 195

Athenaeus:—

vii. (282b) 95

Auctor ad Herennium:—

iv. (22) 56, (29) 29

Caesar:—

Bell. Gall. i. (50, 5) 97; iv. (17, 9) 101

Callimachus:—

ii. (54) 3

Catullus:—

(14) 161, (22) 161; (45) 54; lxiv. (218) 204;
 lxxi. (1) 204

Charisius (ap. Keil G.L.):—

i. (112, 9) 167

Cicero:—

- ad Att.* iv. (5, 1), 55; v. (2, 3) 101, (19, 2) 101;
 vi. (1, 17) 164; vii. (22, 2) 101; viii. (11, 4)
 101; x. (15, 2) 55
pro Balb. xxvii. (61) 40 n. 5
Brutus lviii. (211) 196
ad fam. i. (7) 44; x. (31-33) 103
de prom. cons. xi. (28) 40 n. 5

Dio Cassius:—

53 (32) 204; 54 (23) 191, (25) 192; 55 (23)
 194, (25) 193

Donatus:—

Vita Verg. (19) 156

Euripides:—

Orestes (86) 100
Troades (423-6) 55

Glosses:—

Corpus Glossarum Latinarum ii. (121, 17) 209,
 (525, 13) 196

Hero:—

Belop. (3, 30, 32) 82

Herodotus:—

i. (60) 199
 iv. (17 sq.) 53; v. (33, 2) 53

Hesiod:—

Suitors, Rzach fr. 96 (60, 61) 131
Works and Days (40, 41) 128 f., (270-3) 129 f.

Homer:—

Hymns to Dionysos i. (11), vii. (42, 55) 197;
 xxiv. (4), xxvi. (11-13) 198
Il. xvi. (158) 123; xix. (88) 123, (365) 124;
 xxiv. (382) 123, (514) 124, (795) 124, (802)
 125
Od. xiv. (161) 125; xxiii. (84) 123

Horace:—

Epod. ii. (67) 162
Epip. i. (3, 130) 160 ff.

Horace—continued:

- Odes* iii. (26, 7) 202; iv. (8, 13) 199 f.
Sat. i. (9, 69) 196

Inscriptions:—

- C.I.A.* (1657) 143 n. 3
 Diehl's *Altitat. Inschriften* (458) 167, (459) 95,
 (460) 167 f.
 Dittenberger's *Sylloge* (618) 142, (631) 143
Ephem. Arch. 1885 (p. 85) 143
 Zvetiaeff (p. 72) 163

Josephus:—

- Ant.* xv. (350) 204; xviii. (3-4) 195

Juvenal:—

- i. (34) 203

Livy:—

- vii. (2) 53; xxi. (1-38) 55; xl. (51, 3) 53

Lucretius:—

- ii. (1154) 90; v. (30) 205

Monumentum Ancyranum:—

- i. (16-19) 187; iii. (22 sqq.) 187, (38) 194;
 v. (35) 191

New Testament:—

- Ev. Joh.* ii. (13) 94

Ovid:—

- Am.* iii. (283) 54
Metam. xiii. (652) 95
Tristia iii. (12, 2) 53

Oxyrhynchus Papyri:—

- i. (35) 202; ii. (215) 205

Pausanias:—

- ii. (16, 7) 104; vi. (26, 2) 93

Philo of Byzantium:—

- iv. (6-12) 82; v. (p. 91, 35) 82

Philo Iudaeus:—

- de plant. Noes* xxviii. (117) 56

Philostratus:—

- Imagg.* i. (14, 785) 95

Photius:—

- Bibl.* (129) 206

Pindar:—

- Pyth.* ii. (72) 205

Plato:—

- Apology* (35b 4) 133, (37d 5) 134, (39b 3) 203,
 (41b 1, 52b 5) 134
Cratylus (385a 1, 390a 1, 393c 1, 393d 3,
 395e 1, 418d 8, 438a 1 sqq.) 136
Crito (52b 5) 134
Euthydemus (273b 4) 134
Euthyphro (5e 2, 6a 8) 133
Io (534a 5) 93
Phaedo (60e 3, 66e 2, 72c 3, 74d 5) 134,
 (68a 7, 68b 3, 88d 2, 100d 5, 101d 3) 135
Philebus (12c 3) 135
Politicus (311c 7) 138
Protagoras (342b 2) 135
Republic (402b 9) 135, (422b 10) 134

Plato—continued:

- Sophist* (224b 1, 240b 7, 241b 4) 137, (241c 2,
 248d 10, 249d 9) 138
Theaetetus (171c 10) 136, (175c 4) 137

Plato Comicus:—

- Phaon* Fr. ii. 139 ff.

Plautus:—

- Amph.* (prol. 90, 91, 26 sqq., 28 sqq., 90 sq.)
 49, (1077) 208
Aulul. (727) 103
Bacch. (107) 49 f., (1106) 50, 81
Cas. (23) 50
Cure. (452) 50
Epid. (15) 52
Merc. (598, 9=842, 3) 50
Poen. (360) 51, (end) 51, (title) 51
Pseud. (146, 7) 52, (371) 50 f., (743) 50
Rud. (829) 52
Trin. (202) 52, (880) 50
Truc. (695, 6) 51

Pliny the Elder:—

- N. H.* ii. (231) 93; xxi. (5, 11) 185; xxx. (1,
 16) 93

Plotinus:—

- Ennead* vi. (1, 11) 202

Plutarch:—

- de Is. et Osir.* (372c) 56
Lys. (28) 95
Pomp. (19) 134

Polybius:—

- xv. (31, 2) 202

Propertius:—

- ii. (12, 25) 196; iii. (18, 31) 205

Quintilian:—

- i. (4, 17) 169, (7, 29) 168

Seneca:—

- Epp.* (55, 7) 198

Sophocles:—

- Elec.* (174) 103
Thy. (fr. 234 N) 95

Statius:—

- Silv.* v. (3, 176 sqq.) 206

Tacitus:—

- Agric.* (1) 56, (21) 56
Annals i. (5) 204; xiii. (45-47) 204
Germ. (11) 97

Terence:—

- Phormio* (502 sq.) 196

Theocritus:—

- xv. (77) 104

Theophrastus:—

- Char.* iii. (6) 19

Thucydides:—

- i. (77, 1) 55

Tibullus:—

- i. (4, 41 sqq.) 122

Valerius Maximus:—

- ii. (4, 4) 53

Virgil:—

Aen.

(57)

sqq.

xii.

Catal.

156

Ciris,

Ἀγγλογάλλ
 ἄγνος, 209

Ἀιολοσίκων,

ἄμιλλα, 209

ἀνδρόγυνο (π

ἀντιβολέω, 1

ἀπόβρητα, 1

Ἀργεῖφόντης

ἀσελγής, 210

ἄσβεστος, 210

ἄσφαλτος, 210

αἰχμὸς, 209

ἑφάκη, 210

γαστήρ, 208,

γαστραφέτης,

γέφυρα, 208,

γυναικόπαιδα

δαλός, 149

δενδῖλλον, 205

ἔθειρα, 209

ἐκπίπτειν, 17

ἐνοσίς, 210

ἐντελέχεια, 210

ἐπισέληνα, 14

aes, 210

-āgen, 209

ahenus, 50

albogilvus, 56

amoenus, 209

arcus, 'bow-d

arma, 210

assiduus, 52

au. = apo-, 210

ane sinistra, 56

auricomus, 26

bief (Fr.), 208

blato, 50

Virgil:—

Aen. i. (267 sqq., 288) 158, (286 sqq.) 157 f.,
(574) 53; ii. (362, 461 sq.) 54; iv. (548
sqq.) 54; vii. (122) 157; ix. (47, 403) 56;
xii. (81) 56
Catal. v. (173, 520 sqq.) 159, (568) 158, ix. (62)
156; xiv (6, 11) 156
Ciris, 24

Virgil—continued:

Ecl. vi. (3) 156 f.
Georg. ii. (458-542) 198; iii. (82) 56; iv. (160)
164, (506) 26, n. 1

Xenophon:—

Mem. i. (4) 54; iv. (3) 54

III.—INDEX VERBORVM.

A.—GREEK.

Ἀγγλογάλλοι, 186
ἄγνος, 209
Αἰολοσίκων, 48
ἀμύλλα, 209
ἀνδρόγυνο (mod. Gk.), 186
ἀντιβολέω, 126
ἀπὸρρήτα, 17
Ἀργεΐφόντης, 208
ἀσελγής, 210
ἀσβεστος, 210
ἀσφαλτος, 210
αὐχμός, 209
ἀφάκη, 210

γαστήρ, 208, 210
γαστραφότης, 83
γέφυρα, 208, 210
γυναικόπαιδα (mod. Gk.), 186

δαλός, 149
δενδύλλω, 209

ἐθειρα, 209
ἐκπίπτειν, 17
ἐνοσις, 210
ἐντελέχεια, 210
ἐπισθλήνα, 141

Ἐρίνυς, 209
εὐθότονον, 82 ff.
εὐνή, 210

ἡπεδανός, 210
ἡπιος, 210

θ, 210
θαλάμμαι, 53
θυλήματα, 142
θώρηξ, 203

κατὰ λόγον, 19 ff.
Κένταυροι, 208
Κρόνος, 204
κτίζω, 209

λαπαρός, 210
λυκάβας, 125
λωβή, 210

μαῖνη, 209
μαίνις, 209
μετὰ λόγον, 19 ff.
μή, 210
μίτος, 210
μπαροῦτι (mod. Gk.), 207

νεῖκος, 210

οἰνωτρόποι, 95
δμυλος, 209
ὀξυβελής, 83
ὀρθὸς λόγος, 22
οὐ ἔνεκα, 16

παλίντονον, 82 ff.
παρασεῖν, 18
πέρδιξ, 209
πλίσσομαι, 209
ποδήρης, 148
πυραμίς, 210
πύργος, 'farm-buildings,' 202

σιμβλός, 209
σίτος, 210
-σον (gerundive), 208
σοφία, 'poesy,' 126

τραπέω, 95
Τριτογένεια, 208

φελούκα (mod. Gk.), 207
φεύγειν, 18
φιλοδικεῖν, 55

B.—LATIN.

aes, 210
-āgen, 209
ahenus, 50
albugiluns, 56
amoenus, 209
arcus, 'bow-drill,' 202
arma, 210
assiduus, 52
au = apo-, 210
aue sinistra, 54
auricomus, 26

bief (Fr.), 208
blato, 50

cassus (noun), 51
cassus (part.), 51
cognitus, 209
Crenaeus, 208

dē, 210
dedit, 169
disertus, 210

efiles (Faliscan), 210

facinus = farcimen, 206
fari, 210
fleo, 210

fluentissimus, 26
fructificare, 104
frugiferentis, 26
fuet, 169
fumus, 210

genu, 199
glūten, 164

habeo, 210
hec, 169
hivire, 210

iānus, 210

inuolare, 196
is, 210
iūilum, 210

lambero, 50
Larunda, 209
lena, 210
Libitina, 210
Licinus, 198
lilium rubens, 185
lisina, 198
littera, 210
loidos, 163
loisa (Italic), 164

-mento, 210
mentula, 208
mulleus, 210

naper (Etruscan), 203
naputae, 203
-ne, 210
nē, 210

negare, 210
nesciō quis, 50
nihil (Plautus), 50 f.
nux, 208

-ont- (pres. part.), 210

pacre (Mars.), 210
paries, 198
pennipotentis, 26
perhibeo, 26 and n. 1
pleores, 163
ploirume, 169
plus, 163
pontifices, 210
printemps (Fr.), 209
probus, 204
promitto, 208

Quirites, 208

religio uera, 204
rovarii, 210

salebra, 208
sangunculum, 206
scurra, 52
secus, 209
spēratrīx, 50
spural (Etruscan), 203
sycophanta, 199

ten- (Etruscan), 203
teneo, 210
tener (fem.), 206
tul (Etruscan), 203
tumeo, 210
tundo, 210

uārus, 210
uē-, 210
uestibulum, 210
uestigium, 210
uideor, 104
uinolentus, 207
uitare, 210
uola, 196

